

RESTRICTED — Not to be released outside the General Accounting Office except on the basis of specific approval by the Office of Congressional Relations.
RELEASED
RED-76-24
2-27-76
090071



**REPORT OF THE
COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES**

090071

**Processing Applications For
Food Stamps:
How Long Does It Take?**

**Food and Nutrition Service
Department of Agriculture**

GAO reviewed 3,241 applications for food stamps in 16 projects in 7 states--California, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Michigan, Ohio, and Texas. About a third of the applications were processed within 7 days; over half were processed within 14 days; and more than three-fourths were processed within 30 days. Applicant delay in providing required documentation was the most important cause of increased processing times.

RED-76-74

907284

FEB. 27, 1976

090071



COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

A-51604

clt
R
The Honorable Thomas S. Foley
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture H100
House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Pursuant to your August 1, 1975, request, we have reviewed the processing of applications for food stamps and have compiled information on the speed of servicing food stamp applicants at selected locations. We obtained information on how applications were submitted and processed, how long the processing took, why processing took as long as it did, and the results of verifying information on the applications.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND
SCOPE OF REVIEW

The food stamp program, authorized by the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended (7 U.S.C. 2011), is designed to help low-income households obtain nutritionally adequate diets by supplementing their food budgets. The program is administered nationally by the Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture. State and county agencies administer the program locally. 513
42

Under the program participating households buy food stamps with value greater than their purchase price and use them to buy food at authorized stores. The prices the participants pay for the stamps and the total values of stamps they receive are based on household size, income, and certain expenses; extremely low-income households get food stamps free. Households in which all members receive public assistance (welfare) are automatically eligible to receive food stamps, but they pay for the stamps in proportion to their incomes.

We conducted our review at 16 projects in 7 States. We selected the locations to obtain wide geographic coverage and to include large and small projects in both rural and urban areas. The information we compiled should be representative of circumstances in the 16 projects but may not be representative of circumstances in other projects or other States. The 16 projects, the cities we visited, and the number of participants in each project as of September 1975 are shown below.

<u>Project</u>	<u>Participants</u>	<u>Cities</u>
1. Cook County, Ill.	667,547	Chicago
2. Boone County, Ill.	600	Belvidere
3. Marion County, Ind.	50,287	Indianapolis
4. Porter County, Ind.	1,756	Valparaiso
5. Dallas County, Tex.	92,488	Dallas
6. Wayne County, Mich.	253,411	Detroit
7. Monroe County, Mich.	5,675	Monroe
8. Cuyahoga County, Ohio	193,527	Cleveland
9. Medina County, Ohio	2,764	Medina
10. Baltimore (City), Md.	166,737	Baltimore
11. Harford County, Md.	5,518	Bel Air
12. Cecil County, Md.	4,040	Elkton
13. San Francisco County, Calif.	84,421	San Francisco
14. Alameda County, Calif.	71,888	Oakland
		Fremont
		Hayward
15. Monterey County, Calif.	15,330	Salinas
16. El Dorado County, Calif.	2,419	Placerville

The detailed data we compiled for each project is presented as tables A through E of this report. The number listed for each project identifies the tables containing information for that project; for example, Cook County information is in tables A-1 through E-1.

In each of the 8 large projects (over 50,000 participants), we randomly selected for review about 250 completed new cases initiated about August 1975 and about 100 new cases pending with caseworkers 1/ at the times of our visits (October and November 1975). We generally visited five different food stamp offices in each large project. In each of the 8 small projects, we visited 1 office and randomly selected for review 50 completed new cases and 20 pending new cases, except where fewer than 20 cases were pending. We reviewed a total of 2,406 completed cases and 835 pending cases.

1/There were no pending cases in Cuyahoga County.

HOW APPLICATIONS WERE
SUBMITTED AND PROCESSED

Applicants initiate food stamp applications by calling or visiting local food stamp offices. Some of the projects we reviewed allowed individuals to walk in, submit applications and/or be interviewed on a first-come-first-served basis, but most required or preferred appointments, especially for interviews. Nearly all of the projects told the applicants before the interview which documents would be needed to verify information on the application. This was not usually possible for walk-in applicants. The information for which verifying documents are commonly required and the types of documents usually accepted are:

Income--pay stubs; employer's statements; copies of checks.

Mandatory deductions--tax withholding schedules; pay stubs.

Resources--bank books and statements; vehicle registrations; appraisal statements.

Medical expenses--bills; receipts; statements.

Child care expenses--statements from babysitters.

Tuition--statements from educational institutions.

Child support and alimony--copies of court decrees; statements from spouses.

Shelter costs and proof of residence--mortgage and rent receipts; utility bills.

After the key information on the applications was verified, applications were approved or denied based on nationwide eligibility standards, and bonuses--the difference between the price of the stamps and their value--were determined. For approved applications, authorizations to purchase food stamps were then issued each month and the participating households could use the authorizations to obtain their food stamp allotments. Authorizations to purchase food stamps were usually issued by computer, especially in the eight large projects.

Households with emergency needs for food stamps were given expedited service in the application processing.

HOW LONG IT TOOK TO PROCESS APPLICATIONS

About a third of the applications we reviewed were processed within 7 days and more than half were processed within 14 days. More than three-fourths of the cases were processed within 30 days.

Some of the projects we reviewed did not have records showing the dates of applicants' initial contacts with the local food stamp offices, and, in those cases, the date the application was submitted was the earliest date in the records. Processing times are summarized below for the 3,241 cases reviewed. Time frames are shown separately for the 1,683 cases for which the date of initial contact was available and for the 1,558 cases for which the date of application submission was used.

	<u>Percent of cases processed</u>	
	<u>From initial contact</u>	<u>From submission of application</u>
Within:		
7 days	33	42
14 days	55	64
21 days	71	77
30 days	84	90
Over 30 days	16	10

Food and Nutrition Service regulations require applications for food stamps to be approved or denied within 30 days of their submission, but additional time can elapse between an applicant's initial contact and the time the application is submitted, as well as between the application's approval and the issuance of the authorization to purchase food stamps. Where possible, our review took this additional time into account (see table below). Pending legislation (H.R. 7887) would require that applications be approved or denied before verifying key information, but would allow those projects issuing all of their authorizations within 30 days of the applicants' initial contacts to be exempted from this requirement.

Average processing times for applications are shown below.

<u>Processing steps</u>	<u>Average number of days</u>	
	<u>Completed cases</u>	<u>Pending cases</u>
Initial contact to submission of an application	4.4	5.7
Application submission to interview	1.8	1.9
Interview to completion of verification	5.7	13.4
Completion of verification to approval or denial	1.2	3.1
Approval of application to issuance of an authorization to purchase stamps	6.1	-
Total process--from initial contact	16.9	21.2
Total process--from submission of application	13.5	16.2

In selecting pending cases for review, we generally did not include approved cases awaiting issuance of authorizations to purchase food stamps. All cases appeared to be treated the same in that step and therefore, the time needed to complete that step would probably have been about the same for pending cases as it was for completed cases. For completed cases only, the issuance of authorizations was the longest step, especially in projects where this was done by computer; however, considering both completed and pending cases, verification of information was the longest step.

In some cases authorizations to purchase food stamps were issued on the same day as the initial contact; however, processing sometimes took as long as 218 days for completed cases and 259 days for pending cases.

Average processing time was much longer in the large projects--16.6 days for completed cases and 20.4 days for

pending cases--than it was in the small projects--8.8 days for completed cases and 13.1 days for pending cases.

Tables A and B for each project show additional details on how long it took to process food stamp applications.

WHY PROCESSING TOOK AS LONG AS IT DID

For each case we reviewed taking longer than 7 days to process, we tried to determine what caused the processing to take as long as it did and the time associated with each cause. We assessed the overall importance of the different causes by considering the number of cases affected by each cause and the average length of processing time attributable to that cause.

Applicant failure to furnish, or to promptly furnish, required documentation was the most important cause of application processing delays. Other reasons for delays, in order of their importance, were (1) work backlogs due to large numbers of applicants, (2) problems with computer processing and issuance of authorizations to purchase food stamps, (3) suspension of authorization issuances during the last week of each month because there would not be adequate time for applicants to obtain stamps for that month, and (4) rescheduling interviews for applicants' convenience.

Additional detail on reasons for delays in processing applications is contained in the enclosed summaries of work results and in table C for each project. Workload data is shown in table D for each project.

BENEFITS RESULTING FROM VERIFICATION

For each of the completed cases reviewed, except for 87 public assistance cases in Alameda County, California, we attempted to determine the benefits resulting from verification; that is, whether verifying key information on the application resulted in a monthly food stamp bonus that was different than what it would have been had the information not been verified. The number of cases in which we could determine the results of verification and the amount of change in the monthly bonus are shown in table E for each project and are summarized below.

	<u>Cases</u>	Change in monthly <u>bonus</u>
Results determinable:		
Benefits to the Government	410	\$20,027
Benefits to the recipient	162	5,030
Benefits unchanged	<u>826</u>	
Subtotal	1,398	
Results not determinable	<u>921</u>	
Total	<u>2,319</u>	

In many cases we were unable to determine results from verification because the records did not show unverified information or did not distinguish between verified and unverified information. The changes in food stamp bonuses because of verification were due primarily to understatement of household income and overstatement of shelter expense.

We also asked local officials about their experiences and views on approval of applications before verification. All those expressing views on the subject believed that such a policy would lead to widespread errors in food stamp bonuses and to ineligible households receiving stamps.

- - - -

In accordance with instructions from your office, this report has not been reviewed by Federal, State, or local officials responsible for the activities discussed.

Sincerely yours,

Leue B. Atack

Comptroller General
of the United States

C o n t e n t s

		<u>Page</u>
APPENDIX		
I	Summary of results Cook and Boone Counties, Illinois, Marion and Porter Counties, Indiana	1
II	Summary of results Dallas County, Texas	5
III	Summary of results Monroe and Wayne Counties, Michigan, Cuyahoga and Medina Counties, Ohio	9
IV	Summary of results Baltimore City and Harford and Cecil Counties, Maryland	13
V	Summary of results Alameda, El Dorado, Monterey, and San Francisco Counties, California	18
TABLE		
A-1 to A-16	Summary of completed and pending cases taking over 7 days	21
B-1 to B-16	Time spent in major processing steps	45
C-1 to C-16	Major causes of delays in processing applications	68
D-1 to D-16	Total workload from January to October 1975	84
E-1 to E-16	Changes in bonus dollars resulting from verifying information fur- nished by applicants	100

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

COOK AND BOONE COUNTIES, ILLINOIS,

MARION AND PORTER COUNTIES, INDIANA

We visited 12 offices serving 4 project areas in Illinois and Indiana--1 office each in Belvidere (Boone County), Illinois and Valparaiso (Porter County), Indiana; and 5 each in Chicago (Cook County) and Indianapolis (Marion County). We reviewed 835 randomly selected case files.

HOW APPLICATIONS WERE SUBMITTED AND
PROCESSED AT LOCATIONS VISITED

All of the offices told applicants in advance what supporting records they would need to establish eligibility. The Illinois offices also screened applicants to establish their potential eligibility and their immediate need for assistance. All of the offices used an appointment system to accept applications and interview applicants, but they provided immediate service for emergencies. In addition, the central Marion County office, which handled a majority of the county's applicants, routinely interviewed walk-in applicants.

All of the offices urged applicants to complete their application before the interview, except in Marion County where the interviewers usually prepared the complete application.

The Illinois offices manually issued authorizations to purchase food stamps for the first month and the State's central computer issued the recurring authorizations. In Indiana, Marion County printed authorizations with its own computerized system. For Porter County, the State issued authorizations through its centralized computer system for new applicants approved during the first half of the month.

HOW LONG IT TOOK TO PROCESS APPLICATIONS

Processing took over 7 days in about 65 percent of the 835 cases reviewed. Processing times for the projects are summarized below.

Project area (county)	<u>Completed cases</u>			<u>Pending cases</u>		
	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Average</u> (number of days)	<u>Range</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Average</u> (number of days)	<u>Range</u>
Boone	50	7.7	0 to 19	20	3.0	0 to 16
Cook	250	24.9	0 to 122	100	28.1	0 to 109
Marion	250	10.4	0 to 32	100	18.4	1 to 30
Porter	50	13.1	7 to 37	15	24.3	11 to 37

Of the 600 completed cases we reviewed in the 4 projects, 88 percent of the applications were either denied or had the authorizations issued within 30 days of the applicants' initial contact with local food stamp offices. Detailed information on processing times is contained in tables A-1 through A-4 and B-1 through B-4.

In completed cases a major portion of the processing time was between the applicants' initial contacts with the welfare agency and the day they submitted applications (6.8 days for Boone County and 7.7 days for Cook County). Another time-consuming phase was from application approval to issuance of authorization to purchase (3.7 days in Porter County and 11.1 days in Cook County). For pending cases the time between the interview and completion of verification seemed long (18.4 days in Marion County and 17.3 days in Porter County). In Porter County an additional delay frequently occurred because the issued authorizations were not mailed and the applicants were not notified that the authorizations were ready for pickup.

WHY PROCESSING TOOK AS LONG AS IT DID

The applicant's failure to furnish, or delays in furnishing, required records was a frequent cause of delays and resulted in the longest average number of days delay. A major factor contributing to the length of these delays in Cook County was that the county allowed applications to remain pending instead of denying them when the applicant did not provide required records after a certain length of time.

The interviewers' workload was a major and frequent cause of delay in Cook, Boone, and Porter Counties. On approved cases, the clerical workload and procedures were major causes of delays in Cook and Marion Counties. Inexperienced staff and heavy workloads also caused delays in supervisors' processing of cases in Marion County.

Sharp increases in food stamp applications caused workload problems and extended processing times in the Illinois

offices. During this same time period, there were also backlogs of applications for public assistance, and it was the practice to give priority to processing public assistance cases by shifting staff. The large workload in Cook County at the end of September 1975 (see table D-1) was the result, at least in part, of strikes and the shifting of priorities between the food stamp and public assistance workloads.

The States' centralized computer systems for issuing authorizations were major sources of delays in some cases. Although Porter County could have issued its authorizations manually the same day that applicants were approved, it was prevented from doing so by State procedural requirements. The computerized system in Marion County also caused delays in issuing authorizations because it did not process authorizations after a certain date each month. Additional detail on the reasons for delays is presented in tables C-1 through C-4 while tables D-1 through D-4 present workload data for January to October 1975.

BENEFITS RESULTING FROM VERIFICATION

We reviewed the completed cases at each office to determine whether verification of applications resulted in decreases or increases in the monthly bonus value of stamps to be issued to applicants. The results of our review for the four counties are shown in detail in tables E-1 through E-4 and are summarized below.

	<u>Illinois</u>		<u>Indiana</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	Change in monthly Cases <u>bonus</u>		Change in monthly Cases <u>bonus</u>		Change in monthly Cases <u>bonus</u>	
Results deter- minable:						
Benefits to the Government	52	\$1,862	6	\$227	58	\$2,089
Benefits to the recipient	12	237	2	103	14	340
Benefits un- changed	<u>150</u>		<u>55</u>		<u>205</u>	
Subtotal	214		63		277	
Results not determinable	<u>86</u>		<u>237</u>		<u>323</u>	
Total	<u>300</u>		<u>300</u>		<u>600</u>	

About 90 percent of the \$2,089 decrease in applicants' monthly bonus value was due either to an understatement of income (51.2 percent), particularly wages and salaries, or to an overstatement of shelter and child care expenses (38.4 percent). In those cases in which verification results were not determinable, it was generally because the records did not distinguish between verified and unverified information or did not show unverified information.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

We visited 5 offices serving the Dallas County project area and reviewed 350 randomly selected case files.

HOW APPLICATIONS WERE SUBMITTED AND
PROCESSED AT LOCATIONS VISITED

Applications for food stamps could be obtained by telephone request, mail, or in person at any of the five food stamp offices visited. Upon receipt of a signed application, an interview was scheduled and the applicant was told what information and documents would be needed.

Under new procedures established on a trial basis during our review, the caseworker attempted to verify application information during an interview in the applicant's home. In many instances, however, the applicant did not have the required documentation on hand and further processing of the case was delayed until the applicant brought the information to the food stamp office.

If the application was approved, the applicant and the State welfare department's computer center were notified. The computer center issued the authorization to purchase food stamps and mailed it to the applicant.

"Emergency" applicants--persons who did not have the food or money to survive for 7 days--were interviewed in their homes on the same day or the day after they came to the food stamp office and completed an application. If the emergency applicant could provide the required documentation to prove his eligibility, he was manually issued an authorization in 4 to 24 hours.

"Semi-emergency" applicants--persons who had resources to last 7 days, but not enough to last through the normal 30-day processing period--also received immediate home interviews. After proof of eligibility was established and the application was processed and approved, the authorization was issued by the State welfare computer center within 7 days.

HOW LONG IT TOOK TO PROCESS APPLICATIONS

Processing took over 7 days in about 92 percent of 350 cases reviewed in Dallas County. The processing times

for completed and pending cases are summarized below and are presented in more detail in tables A-5 and B-5.

Project area (county)	<u>Completed cases</u>			<u>Pending cases</u>		
	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Range</u>
	(number of days)			(number of days)		
Dallas	250	22.6	0 to 87	100	29.3	1 to 78

For the 250 completed cases reviewed, 77 percent of the applications were denied or had authorizations to purchase stamps issued within 30 days of the applicants' initial contacts with local food stamp offices.

The longest step in the application process for both completed and pending cases (see table B-5) was the time between application submission and the interview (9.4 days for completed cases and 15.0 days for pending cases). The second longest interval for both completed and pending cases occurred between the interview and completion of verification (5.5 days for completed cases and 9.4 days for pending cases).

WHY PROCESSING TOOK AS LONG AS IT DID

The interview delays affecting completed cases were caused by a temporary decrease in the number of food stamp caseworkers assigned to application processing. The interview delays for pending cases were caused by this same decrease in staff and also by a decline in caseworker productivity due to a change in processing procedure.

During the period the cases we reviewed were in process, the State welfare department operated under a job freeze and several food stamp caseworkers were temporarily loaned to a fraud investigation unit. In addition, during the period the pending cases were in process, the home interview program was initiated on a trial basis.

Caseworkers could usually schedule eight office interviews per day but could usually schedule only four to five new home visits daily. These schedules were further reduced if applicants did not keep their home appointments. The decline in staff and initiation of the home interview program, however, did not affect an office's ability to respond to the needs of emergency and semi-emergency applicants.

Applicant failure to furnish, or delay in furnishing, supporting documentation was the major cause of verification delay. Forty-five cases taking more than 7 days to complete were delayed an average of 18.4 days while caseworkers waited for receipt of supporting documentation from applicants. Fifteen applications pending more than 1 week were delayed an average of 15.2 days for this reason.

Other reasons for processing delays included (1) applicants not returning completed applications promptly, (2) interview rescheduling for applicants' convenience, and (3) computer delays or errors. Additional detail on the reasons for delays is presented in table C-5.

The workload at the 5 offices from January through September 1975 averaged 8,137 new applications, reapplications, and recertifications, ranging from a low of 6,633 cases in August to a high of 10,225 cases in March (see table D-5). The pending caseload remained relatively constant during this period. As the workload varied between the five offices, staff was shifted to meet peak demands.

BENEFITS RESULTING FROM VERIFICATION

We reviewed the completed cases at the five offices to determine whether verification of applications resulted in decreases or increases in the bonus value of stamps to be issued to applicants. The results of our review for Dallas County are shown in table E-5 and are summarized below.

	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Change in monthly bonus</u>
Results determinable:		
Benefits to the Government	112	\$6,699
Benefits to the recipient	45	1,447
Benefits unchanged	<u>66</u>	
Subtotal	<u>223</u>	
Results not determinable	<u>27</u>	
Total	<u><u>250</u></u>	

During our review, local food stamp officials gave us an illustration of the abuse that could result from "instant certification" of applicants with later verification of application data. In 1974 these officials entered into

an agreement with the Dallas County Welfare Department under which all referrals from the welfare department were certified for food stamps and the food stamp bonus was calculated without verification. In return, Dallas County agreed to reimburse the food stamp program if overpayments occurred. In the period from April 1974 to July 1975, 407 referrals involving \$53,515 in bonus stamps were accepted without prior investigation or verification. Subsequent verification by food stamp personnel disclosed that unreported applicant income caused 108 overissuances totaling \$4,994. Dallas County reimbursed the Department of Agriculture for these overpayments.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

MONROE AND WAYNE COUNTIES, MICHIGAN

CUYAHOGA AND MEDINA COUNTIES, OHIO

We visited 12 offices serving 4 project areas in Michigan and Ohio--1 office each in Monroe County, Michigan, and Medina County, Ohio, and 5 offices each in Detroit (Wayne County) and Cleveland (Cuyahoga County). We reviewed 741 case files selected at random.

HOW APPLICATIONS WERE SUBMITTED AND
PROCESSED AT LOCATIONS VISITED

Food stamp applicants in Cuyahoga, Medina, and Monroe Counties could obtain an interview by appointment or on a walk-in basis. If time permitted, walk-in applicants were interviewed the same day. Interview appointments were encouraged, however, and were used by most of the applicants in these three counties. Medina and Monroe Counties sent packets of information, describing the documents needed to establish eligibility, to persons making appointments; Cuyahoga County told persons who telephoned what was needed and gave a check list to walk-ins.

Wayne County accepted applications only on a walk-in, first-come-first-served basis. Three of the five Wayne County offices we visited had established quotas for the minimum number of interviews each caseworker would conduct each day. Applicants who would have been in excess of the quotas were advised that they might not be interviewed that day and that they might wish to try again another day. Wayne County applicants were generally not told in advance what documents to bring, and much of the key information needed was not entered on the applications until documentation was supplied.

In all four counties the information reported on the applications was verified to source documents supplied by the applicant. In the smaller counties of Medina and Monroe, certification workers occasionally confirmed employment data by telephone when applicants were unable to provide documentary support for income.

Applicants who did not bring required documents to the first interview were handled differently in each of the four

project areas. Cuyahoga County denied the applications and when applicants returned, a new application was prepared. In Wayne County, applications were held in a pending status while the applicant obtained additional documentation and returned for a second interview. Returning applicants were interviewed on a first-come-first-served basis with other applicants. In Monroe County, applications were held in a pending status and the applicant was given interview priority when returning with additional documentation. In Medina County, applications were held in a pending status and the subsequent interview was scheduled by appointment.

The Michigan offices manually issued the initial authorizations to purchase food stamps and county computers issued later authorizations. Cuyahoga County issued all authorizations by computer except in cases of emergency, while Medina County issued all of their authorizations manually.

HOW LONG IT TOOK TO PROCESS APPLICATIONS

Processing took over 7 days in 46 percent of the 741 cases reviewed. Of the 600 completed cases we reviewed, approximately 94 percent of the applications were denied or authorizations to purchase were issued within 30 days of the applicants' initial contacts with local food stamp offices. The total processing time is understated for Wayne, Cuyahoga, and Medina Counties because records of initial contacts were not kept. Processing times for the project areas are summarized below.

Project area (county)	Completed cases			Pending cases		
	Cases	Average (number of days)	Range	Cases	Average (number of days)	Range
Cuyahoga	250	8	0 to 39	-	-	-
Medina	50	4	0 to 31	20	12	0 to 29
Monroe	50	7	0 to 30	21	20	6 to 47
Wayne	250	12	0 to 218	100	15	0 to 69

Detailed information on processing times is contained in tables A-6 through A-9 and B-6 through B-9. Cuyahoga County had no pending cases because it denied applications if all documentation was not supplied at the interview. While it appears from table B-8 that Cuyahoga County did not incur delays in verifying applications, the time interval between applications by the same applicant could be considered

verification delays. We did not obtain information on how long such intervals were. At 1 Cuyahoga County office, applicants in 13 of the 75 cases reviewed had to reapply at least once to be approved.

In both completed and pending cases for all four counties, the major processing delay occurred in verifying information reported on the application. Also, in Wayne, Cuyahoga, and Medina Counties, delays occurred in issuing food stamp authorizations. (See tables B-6 through B-9.)

WHY PROCESSING TOOK AS LONG AS IT DID

Delays in verification occurred because applicants did not bring the necessary supporting documentation to their first interview. In Monroe, Cuyahoga, and Medina Counties, some applicants neglected to bring the required documentation, even when told what documents to bring. Wayne County interviews were held on a first-come-first-served basis and applicants were generally not told in advance what documents to bring.

Delays in issuing initial authorizations to purchase stamps occurred in one Wayne County office because food stamp certification workers did not issue authorizations manually as required. Computer processing of authorizations caused delays in Cuyahoga County. Tables C-6 through C-9 provide additional detail on reasons for delays while tables D-6 through D-9 present workload data from January to September 1975.

BENEFITS RESULTING FROM VERIFICATION

We reviewed the completed cases at each office to determine whether verification of applications during initial processing resulted in changes in the monthly bonus value of stamps to be issued to applicants. In Wayne and Monroe Counties, however, we were unable to determine the benefits resulting from verification because the records did not include unverified information.

The results of our review for Cuyahoga and Medina Counties where we were able to determine the benefits resulting from verification are shown in detail in tables E-8 and E-9 and are summarized below.

	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Change in monthly bonus</u>
Results determinable:		
Benefits to the Government	98	\$5,622
Benefits to the recipient	42	1,832
Benefits unchanged	<u>160</u>	
Subtotal	300	
Results not determinable	<u>300</u>	
Total	<u>600</u>	

In Cuyahoga County we were able to categorize results by verification item (see table E-8). Verification of earned income and shelter expenses accounted for about 55 percent of the benefit changes.

Food stamp officials in all four counties opposed "instant certification" of applicants with later verification of application data. They cited (1) the inadequacy of the size of the present staff to handle the anticipated increase in the number of applications, (2) the probability that a backlog of cases pending verification would develop, and (3) a likely increase in the number of fraudulent applications filed. Wayne County food stamp officials said that their welfare department had recently experimented with "presumptive eligibility" for aid to families with dependent children applicants. According to these officials, presumptive eligibility resulted in a large number of fraudulent applications being filed, and they believed instant certification would produce a similar result in the food stamp program.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

BALTIMORE CITY AND HARFORD

AND CECIL COUNTIES, MARYLAND

We visited seven offices serving three project areas in Maryland--one office each in Harford and Cecil Counties and five offices in the City of Baltimore. We reviewed a total of 488 randomly selected case files.

HOW APPLICATIONS WERE SUBMITTED AND PROCESSED
AT LOCATIONS VISITED

Upon contacting local food stamp offices, applicants were told when their interviews would be held and what documentation was needed to verify applications. Three Baltimore offices and the Cecil County office scheduled interviews either by appointment or on a walk-in basis; two Baltimore offices and the Harford County office scheduled interviews by appointment only. In six of the seven offices, the applicant filled out the application which was reviewed and verified by a caseworker. In Cecil County the application was filled out by the caseworker during the interview.

If, as normally happened, an applicant did not bring all the necessary documentation to the interview, he was given a list of the items needed and was asked to supply them within 15 days. Each applicant also was checked through a master file to determine whether he was receiving or had received food stamps. After all documentation was received and the master file clearance completed, the caseworker determined whether the applicant was eligible for food stamps. The caseworker then notified the applicant of the decision and, for those found eligible, prepared an approval document.

After the approval document was prepared, the procedures followed by the three project areas varied. In Baltimore, the five offices sent the approval documents to a central edit and control section for a check on accuracy and completeness. From there the approval documents were sent to an automatic data processing section where authorizations to purchase were printed. The authorizations were then sent to another location for mailing to the applicants.

In Harford County, the project office used the approval documents to type initial authorizations to purchase,

valid for the first month. These were then mailed to the applicants. For later months, the authorizations were printed by a county computer. Authorizations to purchase were not used in Cecil County. Instead, the approval documents were sent to a central issuance office where participants signed issuance cards each time they obtained food stamps.

In all three project areas, caseworkers attempted to expedite processing of applications for persons in an emergency situation. The same steps were followed as for normal applications, but the processing times between steps were reduced whenever possible.

HOW LONG IT TOOK TO PROCESS APPLICATIONS

Seventy-seven percent of the 488 cases we reviewed took more than 7 days to process. Processing times for the three projects are summarized below.

<u>Project area</u>	<u>Completed cases</u>			<u>Pending cases</u>		
	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Average</u> (number of days)	<u>Range</u>	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Average</u> (number of days)	<u>Range</u>
Baltimore City	251	27.6	0 to 75	97	20.2	1 to 259
Cecil County	50	7.6	0 to 43	15	8.4	0 to 30
Harford County	55	16.2	0 to 62	20	23.0	1 to 69

For the 356 completed cases we reviewed in the 3 project areas, 73 percent of the applications were denied or authorizations to purchase food stamps were issued within 30 days of the applicants' initial contact with local food stamp offices. Detailed information on processing times for these projects is contained in tables A-10 through A-12 and B-10 through B-12.

The interval between interview and completion of verification provided the most frequent delay. In addition, a lengthy processing step in Baltimore was between application approval and issuance of authorizations to purchase food stamps.

The time between initial contact and application submission (usually at the interview) averaged 11.0 days in Harford County and 1.2 days in Cecil County. Complete data on this processing step was not available in Baltimore, but local officials estimated that the wait for an interview ranged from 1 to 21 days.

WHY PROCESSING TOOK AS LONG AS IT DID

Applicant failure to furnish, or delay in furnishing, supporting documentation was the most important cause of verification delay. We found that applicants had the most difficulty in substantiating salaries and wages, social security and unemployment entitlements, and shelter and medical expenses. In Baltimore another major cause of verification delay was the master file clearance. This process--which involved filling out a clearance request, transmitting the request by courier to a central office, and manually checking client history cards--accounted for about half of the 16.2 days between the interview and verification completion. Master files in Cecil and Harford Counties were located in the food stamp offices, and the clearance process was completed in 1 day or less.

Baltimore's delay in issuing authorizations to purchase stamps was caused by the time consumed in data processing procedures and in the movement of approval documents and authorizations. This delay was also affected by Baltimore's practice of not initiating the processing of authorizations after a "cutoff day" (generally 4 to 5 working days before the end of the month) because the applicant would probably not receive the authorizations in time to purchase food stamps before the end of the month. Cecil and Harford Counties issued the current month's food stamp allotment even if the initial request was made on the last working day of the month.

Harford County's delay in holding interviews occurred because of a workload backlog. Tables C-10 through C-12 provide additional detail on reasons for delays in the three project areas.

It appeared that the size of Baltimore's total caseload and its procedures increased processing time. For example, the requirement that all Baltimore applications be funneled into two centers (master file and data processing) added to processing time.

Cecil County applicants received food stamps quicker than applicants in any of the five Baltimore offices although Cecil County had a higher nonpublic assistance caseload per caseworker. Data was not available for public assistance cases receiving food stamps. We did not analyze Harford County's workload per caseworker because of inaccuracies in caseload data. It appeared that Cecil County caseworkers were able to process more applications because:

- Applicants were quicker in supplying additional documentation.
- Supporting documentation was easier to obtain. Legal documents were available in the same building as the food stamp office and quick service for social security and unemployment compensation information was available at nearby offices.
- Master file clearance was obtained in less than half a day.
- Caseworkers appeared to have less outside interruptions while processing applications.
- Interviewers spent less time taking applications. This shorter period may have been due to the interviewer, rather than the applicant, filling out the application form.

Additional detail on workloads for these projects is shown on tables D-10 through D-12.

BENEFITS RESULTING FROM VERIFICATION

We reviewed the completed cases at each office to determine whether verification of applications resulted in changes in bonus value of stamps to be issued to applicants. The results of our review for the three project areas are shown in tables E-10 through E-12 and are summarized below.

	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Change in monthly bonus</u>
Results determinable:		
Benefits to the Govern- ment	21	\$824
Benefits to the recipient	10	247
Benefits unchanged	<u>101</u>	
Subtotal	132	
Results not determinable	<u>224</u>	
Total	<u>356</u>	

Overstatement or understatement of applicant income caused approximately two-thirds of the total change in bonus dollars. In most cases, however, verification results were not determinable because the records either did not distinguish between verified and unverified information or did not show unverified information.

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

ALAMEDA, EL DORADO, MONTEREY, AND
SAN FRANCISCO COUNTIES, CALIFORNIA

In California we conducted our review in five offices in Alameda County and in one office each in San Francisco, Monterey, and El Dorado Counties. San Francisco County had only one office handling nonpublic assistance cases. Altogether, we reviewed 827 case files generally selected at random, including 112 public assistance cases in Alameda County. Work in Alameda County was concentrated in the urban area of Oakland.

HOW APPLICATIONS WERE SUBMITTED AND
PROCESSED AT LOCATIONS VISITED

Three of the four project areas we visited in California accepted applicants by appointment only, except for emergency cases. Prior to their appointments, individuals were provided application forms and lists of needed supporting documents. In Monterey's walk-in system, however, applicants were interviewed on the day of their initial contact if possible.

Applications with incomplete supporting documentation were held until the needed documentation was provided. On a few occasions, San Francisco, Monterey, and El Dorado accepted applicants' undocumented statements if the statements appeared reasonable to the caseworker, but such applications were approved for only 1 month.

Authorizations to purchase food stamps were prepared mechanically by each county's data processing center and sent to the local welfare office or fiscal department for final processing and mailing to the applicant. All four counties had provisions, including manual preparation of the authorizations if necessary, for expediting emergency cases. Also, all four counties had special procedures for issuing food stamps, such as over-the-counter sales and sales by mail.

HOW LONG IT TOOK TO PROCESS APPLICATIONS

Sixty-two percent of the 715 food stamp cases reviewed which did not involve public assistance recipients took longer than 7 days to process. Monterey County, however,

processed all of the 50 completed cases reviewed in less than 7 days. Processing times are summarized below for the four California project areas and are presented in detail in tables A-13 through A-16 and B-13 through B-16.

Project area (county)	Completed cases			Pending cases		
	Cases	Average (number of days)	Range	Cases	Average (number of days)	Range
Alameda	163	25.1	2 to 113	75	28.9	4 to 92
El Dorado	50	12.4	0 to 52	5	11.4	1 to 18
Monterey	50	1.7	0 to 6	22	3.8	0 to 14
San Francisco	250	8.5	0 to 52	100	9.8	0 to 33

Public assistance recipients are automatically eligible for food stamps. In Alameda County we reviewed 87 completed and 25 pending public assistance cases because their processing frequently took longer than 7 days. In the 87 completed public assistance cases we reviewed, the average time for processing the food stamp applications after public assistance was approved was 7.5 days with a range from 0 to 36 days (see table B-14a).

Of the 513 completed nonpublic assistance cases we reviewed in California, 92 percent of the applications were denied or had authorizations to purchase issued within 30 days of the applicants' initial contacts with local food stamp offices.

Major portions of the processing time in California occurred between the interview and completion of verification. Another lengthy step was between approval of the application and issuance of the authorization to purchase stamps.

WHY PROCESSING TOOK AS LONG AS IT DID

Applicants' delay in furnishing supporting documents caused the longest delays in the cases we reviewed in California. California was developing new regulations on verification to reduce the amount of documentation needed and thus possibly reduce the amount of processing time for this step.

Other reasons for delays were the rescheduling of interviews for applicants' convenience and the fact that three of the counties did not issue authorizations to purchase stamps during the last week of the month. This cutoff was made primarily because the applicants would not receive the authorization in time to purchase stamps for that month. Additional

detail on reasons for delays is presented in tables C-13 through C-16; tables D-13 through D-16 present workload data for January to October 1975.

Monterey County welfare officials attributed their speed in processing food stamp applications to their efforts in instructing the community on how to apply for food stamps. Also, all of the completed cases we reviewed in Monterey were initiated in August 1975 when relatively few new applications were being submitted (see table D-15). Local officials said that during a busier month, a day or two might be added to the average processing time.

BENEFITS RESULTING FROM VERIFICATION

For each completed nonpublic assistance case we reviewed in the four projects, we attempted to determine whether verification of application information resulted in changes in the monthly bonus value of stamps to be issued. The results of this effort are summarized below for California and are presented in more detail in tables E-13 through E-16.

	<u>Cases</u>	<u>Change in monthly bonus</u>
Results determinable:		
Benefits to the Government	121	\$4,793
Benefits to the recipient	51	1,164
Benefits unchanged	<u>294</u>	
Subtotal	466	
Results not determinable	<u>47</u>	
Total	<u>513</u>	

Verification of income caused the most changes in bonus dollars--60 of the 121 cases where the changes benefited the Government with \$2,204 of the \$4,793 of the changes and 34 of the 51 cases where the changes benefited the recipient with \$927 of the \$1,164 in bonus value changes. In those cases where verification results were not determinable, it was generally because the records did not include unverified information.

COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
 SUMMARY OF COMPLETED AND PENDING APPLICATIONS
 TAKING OVER 7 DAYS

Number of days after initial contact	Number	
	Completed cases (note a)	Pending cases (note b)
8	6	4
9	10	10
10	5	1
11	4	2
12	2	4
13	7	2
14	3	0
15	5	2
16	7	5
17	3	4
18	4	1
19	2	0
20	4	0
21	7	1
22	3	4
23	4	3
24	3	4
25	7	2
26	5	1
27	9	1
28	7	1
29	3	3
30	2	0
31	5	2
32	2	1
34	3	0
35	3	1
36	1	3
37	3	0
39	2	1
40	2	0
43	2	1
44	1	1
46	1	0
47	1	0
48	0	1
50	2	1
51	1	0
53	1	1

TABLE A-1
(continued)

TABLE A-1
(continued)

Number of days after initial contact	Number	
	Completed cases (note a)	Pending cases (note b)
56	3	0
58	2	0
59	1	1
60	1	0
62	1	0
63	2	0
64	1	1
65	2	0
71	1	0
75	1	0
77	1	0
81	1	0
83	2	0
84	2	0
85	2	0
87	2	1
88	2	0
89	1	0
90	2	0
91	1	1
92	2	1
93	1	1
94	0	1
96	1	1
99	0	3
101	0	1
106	0	1
109	0	1
122	1	0
	<u>178</u>	<u>82</u>

a/The initial contact date was available for 180 of the 250 completed cases and for 138 of the 178 completed cases which took more than seven days. The delays in the other 40 cases were computed from the application submission date.

b/The initial contact date was available for 98 of the 100 pending cases and for 81 of the 82 pending cases which took more than seven days. The delay in the other case was computed from the application submission date.

BOONE COUNTY, ILLINOIS
 SUMMARY OF COMPLETED AND PENDING APPLICATIONS
 TAKING OVER 7 DAYS

Number of days after initial contact	Number	
	Completed cases (note a)	Pending cases
8	1	1
9	1	
10	1	
12	1	
13	1	
14	1	
16		2
19	<u>1</u>	--
	<u>7</u>	<u>3</u>

a/The initial contact date was available for only eight of the 50 completed cases selected and for only five of the seven completed cases taking more than seven days. The delays in the other two cases were computed from the application submission date.

MARION COUNTY, INDIANA
 SUMMARY OF COMPLETED AND PENDING APPLICATIONS
 TAKING OVER 7 DAYS

Number of days after application submission (note a)	Number	
	Completed cases	Pending cases
8	25	2
9	13	1
10	29	
11	8	
12	7	3
13	18	7
14	8	1
15	2	3
16	3	
17	7	
18	2	
19	3	3
20	3	5
21	2	4
22	1	3
23		6
24	4	
26		3
27	3	4
28		2
29	1	2
30	14	26
31	1	
32	1	
	<u>155</u>	<u>75</u>

a/Marion County did not maintain records on the date of an applicant's initial contact. We therefore computed total processing time from the date of application submission. Based on estimates by county officials and our review, applications were usually submitted within 1 day of initial contact.

PORTER COUNTY, INDIANA
 SUMMARY OF COMPLETED AND PENDING APPLICATIONS
 TAKING OVER 7 DAYS (note a)

Number of days after initial contact	Number	
	Completed cases	Pending cases (note b)
8	1	
9	1	
10	2	
11		1
12	3	
13	6	
14	4	1
15	2	
16	1	
17		1
18	1	
19		2
20		1
21		1
24		2
25	1	
28		1
32	1	3
33	1	
35		1
37	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>
	<u>28</u>	<u>15</u>

a/Based on estimates by Porter County officials and our review, an estimated seven days from first contact to application submission is included in processing time.

b/Only 15 cases were pending at time of our review.

TABLE A-5

TABLE A-5

DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

SUMMARY OF COMPLETED AND PENDING APPLICATIONS

TAKING OVER 7 DAYS

<u>Number of days after initial contact</u>	<u>Number</u>	
	<u>Completed cases (note a)</u>	<u>Pending cases (note a)</u>
8	6	1
9	9	3
11	7	
12	5	5
13	5	2
14	5	2
15	15	1
16	6	2
17	7	
18	3	1
19	4	3
20	3	2
21	16	5
22	8	4
23	4	4
24	5	
25	2	
26	3	3
27	3	2
28	4	4
29	4	4
30	4	3
31	3	
32	4	
33	1	2
34	4	6
35	3	3
36	2	5
37	2	2
38	1	
39	1	
40	2	
41	3	2
42	2	1
44	2	
46	1	
48	1	1
49	6	
50	1	
51	1	

TABLE A-5
(continued)

TABLE A-5
(continued)

<u>Number of days after initial contact</u>	<u>Number</u>	
	<u>Completed cases (note a)</u>	<u>Pending cases (note a)</u>
53		1
54		2
55	1	
61		1
62		1
65	1	
72		2
74		1
78		2
79	1	
87	<u>1</u>	
	<u>172</u>	<u>83</u>

a/There were 64 completed cases and 14 pending cases for which the total processing time could not be determined since the date of initial contact was missing from agency records. Fifty-six of the 64 completed cases and 12 of the 14 pending cases took over 7 days based on the first processing date known (generally the application submission date). In 50 of the 64 completed cases authorizations to purchase were issued (or denied) within 30 days of the first processing date known.

WAYNE COUNTY, MICHIGAN

SUMMARY OF COMPLETED AND PENDING APPLICATIONS

TAKING OVER 7 DAYS

Number of days after application submission (note a)	Number	
	<u>Completed cases</u>	<u>Pending cases</u>
8	9	6
9	2	4
10	4	8
11	5	2
12	3	2
13	7	1
14	10	4
15	4	6
16	0	7
17	4	0
18	2	0
20	4	0
21	5	2
22	2	4
23	2	4
24	1	3
25	1	1
26	2	0
27	5	0
28	4	5
29	0	1
30	4	0
31	1	0
32	1	1
33	1	0
34	2	0
35	3	1
36	1	0
37	3	0
39	3	0
41	1	0
43	0	1
45	1	0
48	2	0
49	3	0
51	1	0
55	1	0
57	1	4

TABLE A-6
(continued)

TABLE A-6
(continued)

Number of days after application submission (note a)	Number	
	Completed cases	Pending cases
58	1	0
59	2	0
64	1	0
69	0	1
70	1	0
218	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
	<u>111</u>	<u>68</u>

a/County records did not indicate the date of an applicant's initial contact. We therefore computed total processing time from the date of application submission.

MONROE COUNTY, MICHIGAN

SUMMARY OF COMPLETED AND PENDING APPLICATIONS

TAKING OVER 7 DAYS

Number of days after initial <u>contact</u>	Number	
	<u>Completed</u> <u>cases</u>	<u>Pending</u> <u>cases</u>
8	1	0
9	3	1
11	1	0
12	1	1
13	0	2
14	2	1
15	1	1
16	0	3
17	1	0
18	1	0
19	0	1
20	0	1
22	0	1
23	1	0
26	1	1
30	1	1
35	0	1
40	0	1
41	0	1
47	0	1
	<u>14</u>	<u>18</u>

CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO

SUMMARY OF COMPLETED AND PENDING APPLICATIONS

TAKING OVER 7 DAYS

Number of days after application submission (note a)	Number	
	Completed cases	Pending cases (note b)
8	2	
9	7	
10	10	
11	10	
12	12	
13	5	
14	9	
15	8	
16	2	
17	8	
18	13	
19	8	
20	7	
21	3	
22	1	
25	2	
26	2	
33	1	
39	1	
	<u>111</u>	

a/County records did not indicate the date of an applicant's initial contact. We therefore computed total processing time from the date of application submission.

b/There were no pending cases in Cuyahoga County.

MEDINA COUNTY, OHIO

SUMMARY OF COMPLETED AND PENDING APPLICATIONS

TAKING OVER 7 DAYS

Number of days after application submission (<u>note a</u>)	Number	
	<u>Completed cases</u>	<u>Pending cases</u>
8	0	2
9	1	1
10	0	1
11	1	0
14	1	0
17	0	1
18	1	0
21	0	1
23	0	1
24	0	1
28	1	0
29	0	1
31	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>
	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>

a/County records did not indicate the date of an applicant's initial contact. We therefore computed total processing time from the date of application submission.

BALTIMORE CITY, MARYLAND
 SUMMARY OF COMPLETED AND PENDING APPLICATIONS
 TAKING OVER 7 DAYS

Number of days after application submission (note a)	Number	
	Completed cases	Pending cases
8	4	3
9	3	2
10	6	7
11	3	-
12	9	1
13	5	6
14	10	2
15	6	2
16	2	4
17	6	1
18	6	-
19	5	-
20	11	1
21	6	2
22	8	3
23	9	2
24	5	4
25	5	-
26	6	-
27	8	-
28	7	1
29	9	-
30	7	2
31	4	-
32	5	-
33	3	-
34	4	-
35	7	1
36	3	-
37	5	2
38	3	-
39	3	-
40	4	1
41	3	-
42	6	-
43	3	1
44	6	-
45	5	-
47	3	-
48	2	1
49	4	-

TABLE A-10
(continued)

TABLE A-10
(continued)

Number of days after application submission (note a)	Completed <u>cases</u>	Pending <u>cases</u>
51	1	-
53	1	-
54	1	-
55	1	-
56	2	-
57	1	-
59	1	-
61	1	-
62	3	-
64	2	-
65	-	1
68	1	-
71	1	-
73	1	-
75	1	-
83	-	1
86	-	1
119	-	1
206	-	1
259	-	1
	<u>237</u>	<u>55</u>

a/City records did not indicate the date of an applicant's initial contact in 213 completed and 55 pending cases taking over 7 days. We therefore computed total processing time for these cases from the date of application submission.

HARFORD COUNTY, MARYLAND

SUMMARY OF COMPLETED AND PENDING APPLICATIONS

TAKING OVER 7 DAYS

<u>Number of days after initial contact</u>	<u>Number</u>	
	<u>Completed cases (note a)</u>	<u>Pending cases</u>
8	3	1
9	3	-
10	2	-
11	2	-
12	1	-
13	3	-
14	1	-
15	1	1
16	3	-
17	1	-
18	3	1
19	3	-
20	-	1
21	2	4
22	1	-
23	2	-
24	1	-
25	1	2
27	1	-
28	2	-
29	2	1
30	1	-
32	1	-
34	-	1
35	2	1
36	-	1
50	-	1
62	1	-
69	-	1
	<u>43</u>	<u>16</u>

a/The interview date was used in eight completed cases taking over 7 days where the initial contact date could not be determined. According to agency officials, the wait for an interview ranged from 1 to 2 weeks.

CECIL COUNTY, MARYLAND
 SUMMARY OF COMPLETED AND PENDING APPLICATIONS
 TAKING OVER 7 DAYS

<u>Number of days after initial contact</u>	<u>Number</u>	
	<u>Completed cases (note a)</u>	<u>Pending cases</u>
8	3	1
9	3	-
11	2	-
13	4	-
15	1	1
16	-	2
19	1	2
21	2	-
22	1	-
24	1	-
30	-	1
43	1	-
	<u>19</u>	<u>7</u>

a/The interview date was used in six completed cases taking over 7 days where we could not determine the date of initial contact. According to agency officials, the wait for an interview was about 2 weeks.

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
 SUMMARY OF COMPLETED AND PENDING APPLICATIONS
 TAKING OVER 7 DAYS

<u>Number of days after initial contact</u>	<u>Number</u>	
	<u>Completed cases</u>	<u>Pending cases</u>
8	34	11
9	5	2
10	6	12
11	9	1
12	9	5
13	15	2
14	11	7
15	13	1
16	3	3
17	1	1
18	5	-
19	2	1
20	3	2
21	-	1
22	-	3
23	2	-
24	-	1
25	1	-
26	-	1
28	-	1
30	1	-
33	-	1
40	1	-
52	1	-
	<u>122</u>	<u>56</u>

ALAMEDA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

SUMMARY OF COMPLETED AND PENDING APPLICATIONS

TAKING OVER 7 DAYS

NONASSISTANCE CASES

<u>Number of days after initial contact</u>	<u>Number</u>	
	<u>Completed cases</u>	<u>Pending cases</u>
8	1	3
9	3	-
10	7	3
11	3	2
12	4	-
13	8	-
14	8	3
15	6	3
16	2	1
17	7	2
18	6	1
19	7	3
20	2	5
21	5	3
22	4	2
23	10	-
24	4	3
25	3	4
26	7	1
27	4	1
28	4	2
29	6	-
30	4	-
31	2	-
32	2	3
33	3	3
34	-	4
35	2	4
36	1	-
37	2	-
39	1	-
40	2	2
41	3	1
42	2	-
43	2	2
48	2	-

TABLE A-14
(continued)

TABLE A-14
(continued)

<u>Number of days after initial contact</u>	<u>Number</u>	
	<u>Completed cases</u>	<u>Pending cases</u>
49	-	2
50	1	-
51	-	1
52	1	-
54	2	-
55	-	1
56	3	-
57	1	-
58	1	-
60	-	1
62	1	1
63	-	2
74	-	1
75	1	-
78	1	1
87	1	-
92	-	1
113	1	-
	<u>153</u>	<u>72</u>

ALAMEDA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

SUMMARY OF COMPLETE AND PENDING APPLICATIONS

TAKING OVER 7 DAYS

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE CASES--TOTAL ELAPSED TIME (note a)

<u>Number of days after initial contact</u>	<u>Number</u>	
	<u>Completed cases</u>	<u>Pending cases</u>
8	-	2
10	1	-
11	1	1
13	1	1
14	1	1
16	1	3
19	1	-
20	-	2
21	5	-
22	3	2
23	3	3
24	3	-
25	1	-
26	1	-
27	4	2
28	7	1
29	5	-
30	3	2
31	2	-
32	2	-
33	1	-
34	3	-
35	4	1
37	4	-
38	3	-
39	1	-
41	6	-
42	3	-
43	1	1
45	2	-
47	1	1
49	3	-
51	1	-
52	1	-
55	1	-
56	1	-
63	1	-

TABLE A-14a
(continued)

TABLE A-14a
(continued)

<u>Number of days after initial contact</u>	<u>Number</u>	
	<u>Completed cases</u>	<u>Pending cases</u>
64	1	-
65	1	-
93	1	-
117	-	<u>1</u>
	<u>85</u>	<u>24</u>

a/See Table A-14b for food stamp portion of total elapsed time.

ALAMEDA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

SUMMARY OF COMPLETED AND PENDING APPLICATIONS
TAKING OVER 7 DAYSPUBLIC ASSISTANCE CASES--FOOD STAMP PORTION OF TOTAL ELAPSED
TIME (note a)

Number of days after AFDC approval	Number	
	Completed cases	Pending cases
8	6	-
9	5	-
11	1	-
12	4	-
13	4	-
14	4	-
15	1	-
16	1	-
18	1	-
20	1	-
21	1	-
22	1	-
24	1	-
26	1	-
34	1	-
36	1	-
	<u>34</u>	<u>-</u>

a/See Table A-14a for total elapsed time.

MONTEREY COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
 SUMMARY OF COMPLETED AND PENDING APPLICATIONS
 TAKING OVER 7 DAYS

<u>Number of days after initial contact</u>	<u>Number</u>	
	<u>Completed cases</u>	<u>Pending cases (note a)</u>
8	-	-
9	-	1
10	-	1
11	-	-
12	-	-
13	-	-
14	-	2
15	-	-
	=	4

a/ Twenty-two rather than the prescribed 20 cases were reviewed (see table B-15).

EL DORADO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

SUMMARY OF COMPLETED AND PENDING APPLICATIONS

TAKING OVER 7 DAYS

<u>Number of days after initial contact</u>	<u>Number</u>	
	<u>Completed cases</u>	<u>Pending cases (note a)</u>
8	3	-
9	6	-
10	3	1
11	1	-
12	2	-
13	1	-
14	2	2
15	1	-
16	1	-
17	2	-
18	1	1
19	1	-
20	1	-
22	2	-
23	1	-
26	1	-
28	2	-
37	1	-
39	1	-
52	<u>1</u>	<u>-</u>
	<u>34</u>	<u>4</u>

a/Only five cases were reviewed (see table B-16) since eligibility worker registers showed only five cases in a pending status as of the date of our review.

COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS
TIME SPENT IN MAJOR PROCESSING STEPS

Number of days	Number of cases (note a)					
	First contact to application submission	Application submission to interview	Interview to completion of verification	Completion of verification to approval (denial)	Approval to issuance of ATP	Total processing time
COMPLETED CASES - Initiated in August 1975						
0 (Same day)	96	243	174	201	57	15
1-7	66	5	42	38	56	57
8-14	75		4	9	17	37
15-21	9	1		1	45	32
22-28	1		1		15	38
29-35		1	5		6	18
36-42	1		1		5	8
43-49	1		1		4	5
50-56			1	1	2	7
57-63	1		1			7
64-70					1	3
71-77			12			3
78-84			5			5
85-91			3			10
92-98						4
99-105						
106-112						
113-119						
120-126						1
Total	<u>250</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>208</u>	<u>250</u>
Average (days)	7.7	1.7	8.7	1.1	11.1	24.9
Range (days)	0 to 61	0 to 35	0 to 91	0 to 56	0 to 65	0 to 122

Number of days	Number of cases (note a)					
	First contact to application submission	Application submission to interview	Interview to completion of verification	Completion of verification to approval (denial)	Approval to issuance of ATP	Total processing time
PENDING CASES - As of date of review						
0 (same day)	18	99	50	56	21	1
1-7	48	1	31	2	19	17
8-14	28		8	1	4	23
15-21	5		3		6	13
22-28			1	1	1	16
29-35			2			7
36-42			2			4
43-49			1			3
50-56						2
57-63						1
64-70	1					1
71-77			1			
78-84						2
85-91						4
92-98						4
99-105			1			4
106-112						2
Total	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>100</u>
Average (days)	6.2	0	8.3	1.3	7.4	28.1
Range (days)	0 to 64	0 to 4	0 to 99	0 to 24	0 to 23	0 to 109

46

a/The first contact date was not available in 72 cases (70 completed and two pending). In addition, the time spent could not be determined for one or more of the other major processing steps on three completed cases and 26 pending cases. All these cases were tabulated under the "same day" category and excluded in computing averages for related steps.

BOONE COUNTY, ILLINOIS
 TIME SPENT IN MAJOR PROCESSING STEPS

Number of days	Number of cases					Total processing time
	First contact to application submission	Application submission to interview	Interview to completion of verification	Completion of verification to approval (denial)	Approval to issuance of ATP	
COMPLETED CASES - Initiated in August 1975						
0 (Same day)	44	41	50	48	39	34
1-7	3	7		2		9
8-14	2	2			1	6
15-21	<u>1</u>					<u>1</u>
Total	<u>a/50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>50</u>
Average (days)	6.8	.6	0	.2	.2	7.7
Range (days)	0 to 19	0 to 13	0	0 to 6	0 to 9	0 to 19
PENDING CASES - As of date of review						
0 (Same day)	7					7
1-7	10					10
8-14	1					1
15-21	<u>2</u>					<u>2</u>
Total	<u>20</u>					<u>20</u>
Average (days)	3.0					3.0
Range (days)	0 to 16					0 to 16

a/The initial contact date was not available in 42 of the cases included in the "same day" category.

MARION COUNTY, INDIANA
TIME SPENT IN MAJOR PROCESSING STEPS

TABLE B-3

Number of days	Number of cases					Total processing time
	First contact to application submission (note a)	Application submission to interview	Interview to completion of verification	Completion of verification to approval (denial)	Approval to issuance of ATP	
COMPLETED CASES - Initiated in August 1975						
0 (Same day)						
1-7		250	166	51	5	33
8-14			49	180	169	62
15-21			15	14	22	108
22-28			9	2		22
29-35			2		1	8
			9	3		17
Total		<u>250</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>197</u>	<u>250</u>
Average (days)		0	3.3	3.4	4.8	10.4
Range (days)		0	0 to 30	0 to 30	0 to 28	0 to 32
PENDING CASES - As of date of review						
0 (Same day)		100				
1-7			25			25
8-14			14			14
15-21			15			15
22-28			18			18
29-35			28			28
Total		<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>			<u>100</u>
Average (days)		0	18.4			18.4
Range (days)		0	1 to 30			1 to 30

a/Marion County did not maintain records on the date of an applicant's initial contact. We therefore computed total processing time from the date of application submission. Based on estimates by county officials and our review, applications were usually submitted within 1 day of initial contact.

TABLE B-3

PORTER COUNTY, INDIANA
TIME SPENT IN MAJOR PROCESSING STEPS

Number of days	Number of cases					Total processing time (note a)
	First contact to application submission (note a)	Application submission to interview	Interview to completion of verification	Completion of verification to approval (denial)	Approval to issuance of ATP	
COMPLETED CASES - Initiated in August 1975						
0 (Same day)		50	37	50	21	
1-7	50		6		10	22
8-14			2		7	17
15-21						4
22-28			1			1
29-35			4			2
36-42						4
Total	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>50</u>
Average (days)	7	0	3.8	0	3.7	13.1
Range (days)	7	0	0 to 30	0	0 to 13	7 to 37
PENDING CASES - As of date of review (note b)						
0 (Same day)		15				
1-7	15		2			
8-14			5			2
15-21			3			5
22-28			4			3
29-35			1			4
36-42						1
Total	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>			<u>15</u>
Average (days)	7	0	17.3			24.3
Range (days)	7	0	4 to 30			11 to 37

a/Based on estimates by Porter County officials and our review, an estimated seven days from first contact to application submission is included in processing time.

b/Only 15 cases were pending at time of our review.

DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

TIME SPENT IN MAJOR PROCESSING STEPS

Number of days	Number of Cases					
	First contact to application submission	Application submission to interview	Interview to completion of verification	Completion of verifications to approval (denial)	Approval to issuance of ATP	Total processing time
COMPLETED CASES--Initiated in August 1975						
0 (Same day)	64	10	136	216	34	1
1-7	92	69	48	22	118	13
8-14	17	129	24	7	9	37
15-21	2	29	21	3	1	54
22-28	2	5	13	2	1	29
29-35	2		7			23
36-42	1	1				13
43-49						10
50-56						3
64-70						1
78-84						1
85-91						1
Processing times not determinable because of missing dates	<u>70</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>1</u>	---	---	<u>a/64</u>
Total	<u>250</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>163</u>	<u>250</u>
Average (days) (note b)	4.0	9.4	5.5	1.0	3.4	22.6
Range (days) (note b)	0-36	0-36	0-34	0-25	0-22	0-87

Number of days	Number of Cases					Total processing time
	First contact to application submission	Application submission to interview	Interview to completion of verification	Completion of verifications to approval (denial)	Approval to issuance of ATP	
PENDING CASES--As of date of review						
0 (Same day)	20	5	7			0
1-7	36	8	38			3
8-14	11	36	32			13
15-21	4	25	10			14
22-28	2	7	5			17
29-35	2	3	2			18
36-42	2					10
43-49						1
50-56	1					3
57-63		1	1			2
71-77						3
78-84		1				2
Processing times not determinable because of missing dates	<u>22</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>5</u>			a/ <u>14</u>
	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>			<u>100</u>
Average (days) (note b)	7.1	15.0	9.4			29.3
Range (days) (note b)	0-52	0-84	0-57			1-78

a/The 64 completed and 14 pending cases where the date of initial contact was missing from agency records were excluded from calculations of averages and ranges for total processing time.

b/Cases whose processing times in particular steps were not determinable due to missing dates were excluded from calculations of averages and ranges for those steps.

WAYNE COUNTY, MICHIGAN
TIME SPENT IN MAJOR PROCESSING STEPS

Number of days	Number of cases					Total processing time
	First contact to application submission (note a)	Application submission to interview	Interview to completion of verification (note b)	Completion of verification to approval (denial) (note c)	Approval to issuance of ATP	
COMPLETED CASES--Initiated in August 1975						
0 (Same day)		250	138	192	130	107
1 - 7			36	14	2	32
8 - 14			30	9	5	40
15 - 21			11	4	4	19
22 - 28			4	1	11	17
29 - 35			1	1	3	12
36 - 42			1	0	3	8
43 - 49			0	0	1	6
50 - 56			0	1	0	2
57 - 63			1	0	0	4
64 - 70			1	0	0	2
71 - 77			0	0	1	0
141 - 147			0	1	0	0
218 - 224			0	0	0	1
Verification date not shown			27	27	-	-
Total	-	<u>250</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>160</u>	<u>250</u>
Average (days)	-	0	4	2	5	12
Range (days)	-	0	0-70	0-142	0-76	0-218

Number of days	Number of cases					Total processing time
	First contact to application submission (note a)	Application submission to interview	Interview to completion of verification (note b)	Completion of verification to approval (denial) to issuance of ATP (note c)	Approval to issuance of ATP	
PENDING CASES--As of date of review						
0 (Same day)		100	16	1		1
1 - 7			25	6		31
8 - 14			21	8		26
15 - 21			12	2		15
22 - 28			17	1		18
29 - 35			3	0		3
43 - 49			1	0		1
57 - 63			4	0		4
64 - 70			1	0		1
Total	-	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>18</u>		<u>100</u>
Average (days)	-	0	13	8		15
Range (days)	-	0	0-69	0-22		0-69

a/A date of first contact could not be determined.

b/Verification was not completed on 82 pending cases sampled. For these cases, computations are based on sample selection dates at the five offices visited.

c/Because the approval process had not been completed for any of the 18 pending cases, interval computations are based on the applicable sample selection date.

53

MONROE COUNTY, MICHIGAN

TIME SPENT IN MAJOR PROCESSING STEPS

TABLE B-7

Number of days	Number of cases					
	First contact to application submission	Application submission to interview	Interview to completion of verification	Completion of verification to approval (denial)	Approval to issuance of ATP	Total processing time
COMPLETED CASES - Initiated in August 1975						
0 (Same day)	9	50	44	45	28	8
1 - 7	30	0	0	1	0	28
8 - 14	9	0	1	0	0	8
15 - 21	1	0	1	0	0	3
22 - 28	1	0	0	0	0	2
29 - 35	0	0	0	0	0	1
Verification date not shown	-	-	4	4	-	-
Total	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>50</u>
Average (days)	5	0	1	0	0	7
Range (days)	0-23	0	0-21	0-1	0	0-30
PENDING CASES - As of date of review (a)						
0 (Same day)	3	21	0			0
1 - 7	5	0	12			3
8 - 14	13	0	2			5
15 - 21			2			6
22 - 28			1			2
29 - 35			3			2
36 - 42			1			2
43 - 49			0			1
Total	<u>21</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>21</u>			<u>21</u>
Average (days)	7	0	13			20
Range (days)	0-13	0	1-37			6-47

a/Verification not complete for any pending case. Interval represents elapsed time from interview to date of our review.

TABLE B-7

CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO
 TIME SPENT IN MAJOR PROCESSING STEPS

Number of days	Number of cases					
	First contact to application submission (note a)	Application submission to interview	Interview to completion of verification	Completion of verification to approval (denial)	Approval to issuance of ATP	Total processing time
COMPLETED CASES - Initiated in August 1975						
0 (Same day)		250	240	217	41	87
1 - 7			10	29	31	52
8 - 14			0	3	61	55
15 - 21			0	0	42	49
22 - 28			0	1	4	5
29 - 35			0	0	1	1
36 - 42			0	0	0	1
Total	-	<u>250</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>180</u>	<u>250</u>
Average (days)	-	0	0	1	9	8
Range (days)	-	0	0 - 7	0 - 26	0 - 33	0 - 39

(There were no pending cases in Cuyahoga County.)
 a/A date of first contact could not be determined.

55

MEDINA COUNTY, OHIO

TIME SPENT IN MAJOR PROCESSING STEPS

TABLE B-9

Number of days	Number of cases					Total processing time
	First contact to application submission (note a)	Application submission to interview	Interview to completion of verification	Completion of verification to approval (denial)	Approval to issuance of ATP	
COMPLETED CASES-Initiated in August 1975						
0 (Same day)		50	47	47	8	11
1 - 7			1	2	31	33
8 - 14			0	1	2	3
15 - 21			0	0	1	1
22 - 28			1	0	0	1
29 - 35			1	0	0	1
Total	-	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>50</u>
Average (days)	-	0	1	0	2	4
Range (days)	-	0	0-31	0-11	0-18	0-31
PENDING CASES-As of date of review (b)						
0 (Same day)		13	1			1
1 - 7			3			3
8 - 14			4			4
15 - 21			2			2
22 - 28			2			2
29 - 35			1			1
Dates not shown (note c)		7	7			7
Total	-	<u>20</u>	<u>20</u>			<u>20</u>
Average (days)	-	0	12			12
Range (days)	-	0	0-29			0-29

a/A date of first contact could not be determined.

b/Verification not complete for any pending case. Interval represents elapsed time from interview to date of our review.

c/We could not compute total processing time for seven pending cases because of missing dates.

TABLE B-9

BALTIMORE CITY, MARYLAND
 TIME SPENT IN MAJOR PROCESSING STEPS

Number of days	Number of cases					
	First contact to application submission (note a)	Application submission to interview	Interview to completion of verification	Completion of verification to approval (denial)	Approval to issuance of ATP	Total processing time (note a)
COMPLETED CASES - Initiated in July, August, and September 1975						
0 (Same day)	24	210	16	179	-	2
1 - 7	-	15	58	60	68	12
8 - 14	-	10	65	2	93	40
15 - 21	-	13	43	5	25	42
22 - 28	-	3	25	3	6	48
29 - 35	-	-	21	1	4	39
36 - 42	-	-	11	1	-	28
43 - 49	-	-	6	-	-	22
50 - 56	-	-	3	-	-	6
57 - 63	-	-	3	-	-	6
64 - 70	-	-	-	-	-	3
71 - 77	-	-	-	-	-	3
Total	<u>24</u>	<u>251</u>	<u>251</u>	<u>251</u>	<u>196</u>	<u>251</u>
Average (days)	0	1.8	16.2	1.4	10.4	27.6
Range (days)	0	0 - 25	0 - 61	0 - 36	1 - 35	0 - 75

Number of cases

Number of days	First contact to application submission (note a)	Application submission to interview	Interview to completion of verification	Completion of verification to approval (denial)	Approval to issuance of ATP	Total processing time (note a)
PENDING CASES - As of date of review						
0 (Same day)	-	97	-	-	-	-
1	7	-	42	-	-	42
8	14	-	21	-	-	21
15	21	-	10	-	-	10
22	28	-	10	-	-	10
29	35	-	3	-	-	3
36	42	-	3	-	-	3
43	49	-	2	-	-	2
64	70	-	1	-	-	1
78	84	-	1	-	-	1
85	91	-	1	-	-	1
115	121	-	1	-	-	1
203	209	-	1	-	-	1
259	265	-	1	-	-	1
Total	-	<u>97</u>	<u>97</u>	-	-	<u>97</u>
Average (days)	-	0	20.2	-	-	20.2
Range (days)	-	0	1 - 259	-	-	1 - 259

58

a/The initial contact date could not be determined for 227 completed and 97 pending cases. Therefore, the processing times shown were based on the application submission date. Agency officials estimated that the wait for an interview when an application generally would be submitted ranged from 1 day to 3 weeks following initial contact.

HARFORD COUNTY, MARYLAND
TIME SPENT IN MAJOR PROCESSING STEPS

TABLE B-11

Number of days	Number of cases					
	First contact to application submission (note a)	Application submission to interview	Interview to completion of verification	Completion of verification to approval (denial)	Approval to issuance of ATP	Total processing time (note a)
COMPLETED CASES - Initiated in July and August 1975						
0 (Same day)	4	46	13	54	43	2
1 - 7	8	7	22	1	4	10
8 - 14	14	2	12	-	1	15
15 - 21	12	-	5	-	-	13
22 - 28	2	-	2	-	-	8
29 - 35	-	-	-	-	-	6
36 - 42	-	-	1	-	-	-
57 - 63	-	-	-	-	-	1
Total	40	55	55	55	48	55
Average (days)	11.0	0.8	7.0	0.0	0.4	16.2
Range (days)	0 - 24	0 - 13	0 - 42	0 - 1	0 - 11	0 - 62
PENDING CASES - As of date of review						
0 (Same day)	4	19	-	-	-	-
1 - 7	3	1	4	-	-	4
8 - 14	9	-	1	-	-	1
15 - 21	2	-	7	-	-	7
22 - 28	1	-	2	-	-	2
29 - 35	1	-	3	-	-	3
36 - 42	-	-	1	-	-	1
50 - 56	-	-	1	-	-	1
64 - 70	-	-	1	-	-	1
Total	20	20	20	-	-	20
Average (days)	10.5	0.3	23.0	-	-	23.0
Range (days)	0 - 32	0 - 6	1 - 69	-	-	1 - 69

a/The initial contact date could not be determined for 15 completed cases. Therefore, the processing time for these cases was based on the interview date. According to agency officials, the wait for an interview ranged from 1 to 2 weeks following initial contact.

TABLE B-11

CECIL COUNTY, MARYLAND
 TIME SPENT IN MAJOR PROCESSING STEPS

Number of days	Number of cases					
	First contact to application submission (note a)	Application submission to interview	Interview to completion of verification	Completion of verification to approval (denial)	Approval to issuance of ATP (note b)	Total processing time (notes a and b)
COMPLETED CASES - Initiated in July and August 1975						
0 (Same day)	20	46	19	48	21	6
1 - 7	20	3	21	2	19	25
8 - 14	-	-	7	-	2	12
15 - 21	-	1	2	-	-	4
22 - 28	-	-	-	-	-	2
29 - 35	-	-	1	-	-	-
43 - 49	-	-	-	-	-	1
Total	<u>40</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>50</u>
Average (days)	1.2	0.4	4.4	0.0	2.1	7.6
Range (days)	0 - 6	0 - 15	0 - 31	0 - 1	0 - 12	0 - 43
PENDING CASES - As of date of review						
0 (Same day)	3	15	5	-	-	5
1 - 7	12	-	3	-	-	3
8 - 14	-	-	1	-	-	1
15 - 21	-	-	5	-	-	5
29 - 35	-	-	1	-	-	1
Total	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>15</u>
Average (days)	3.4	0	8.4	-	-	8.4
Range (days)	0 - 6	0	0 - 30	-	-	0 - 30

a/The initial contact date could not be determined for 10 completed cases. Therefore, the processing time for these cases was based on the interview date. According to an agency official, the wait for an interview was about 2 weeks following initial contact.

b/Since authorizations-to-purchase are not used, this interval was based on the date of food stamp issuance.

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
TIME SPENT IN MAJOR PROCESSING STEPS

TABLE B-13

Number of days	Number of cases					
	First contact to application submission	Application submission to interview	Interview to completion of verification	Completion of verification to approval (denial)	Approval to issuance of ATP	Total processing time
COMPLETED CASES--Initiated in August 1975						
0 (Same day)	248	28	228	248	38	8
1-7	2	215	15	2	132	120
8-15	-	5	5	-	50	89
16-21	-	2	2	-	3	27
22-28	-	-	-	-	1	3
29-35	-	-	-	-	1	1
36-42	-	-	-	-	-	1
50-56	-	-	-	-	1	1
Total	<u>250</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>250</u>	<u>226</u>	<u>250</u>
Average (days)	0	3.0	.6	0	5.5	8.5
Range (days)	0-2	0-16	0-18	0-3	0-50	0-52
PENDING CASES--As of date of review						
0 (Same day)	2	100	35	1	-	1
1-7	87	-	46	18	-	43
8-14	7	-	17	5	-	40
15-21	4	-	-	-	-	9
22-28	-	-	2	-	-	6
29-35	-	-	-	-	-	1
Total	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>100</u>
Average (days)	5.1	0	3.9	3.7	-	9.8
Range (days)	0-17	0	0-26	0-9	-	0-33

61

TABLE B-13

ALAMEDA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
 TIME SPENT IN MAJOR PROCESSING STEPS
 NONASSISTANCE CASES

Number of days	Number of cases					
	First contact to application submission	Application submission to interview	Interview to completion of verification	Completion of verification to approval (denial)	Approval to issuance of ATP	Total processing time
COMPLETED CASES--Initiated in August 1975						
0 (Same day)	43	159	12	78	5	-
1-7	93	-	35	18	60	10
8-14	10	-	42	-	26	34
15-21	7	-	35	2	3	35
22-28	2	-	11	-	2	36
29-35	4	-	10	1	-	19
36-42	1	-	5	-	-	11
43-49	2	-	1	-	-	4
50-56	1	-	3	-	-	7
57-63	-	-	1	-	-	3
64-70	-	-	1	-	-	-
71-77	-	-	1	-	-	1
78-84	-	-	-	-	-	1
85-91	-	-	-	-	-	1
99-105	-	-	1	-	-	-
113-119	-	-	-	-	-	1
Cumulative number of cases denied in preceding steps	-	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>77</u>	-
Total	<u>163</u>	<u>163</u>	<u>163</u>	<u>163</u>	<u>163</u>	<u>163</u>
Average (days)	5.4	0	16.0	1.1	6.0	25.1
Range (days)	0-56	0	0-104	0-30	0-27	2-113

TABLE B-14
(continued)

Number of days	Number of cases					Total processing time
	First contact to application submission	Application submission to interview	Interview to completion of verification	Completion of verification to approval (denial)	Approval to issuance of ATP	
PENDING CASES--As of date of review						
0 (Same day)	21	73	2	-	-	-
1-7	39	-	7	3	-	3
8-14	10	-	18	1	-	11
15-21	3	-	14	-	-	18
22-28	2	-	11	-	-	13
29-35	-	-	7	-	-	14
36-42	-	-	5	-	-	3
43-49	-	-	3	-	-	4
50-56	-	-	3	-	-	2
57-63	-	-	1	-	-	4
71-77	-	-	1	-	-	1
78-84	-	-	-	-	-	1
92-98	-	-	1	-	-	1
Total	<u>75</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>75</u>
Average (days)	4.9	0	24.3	5.5	-	28.9
Range (days)	0-26	0	0-92	1-13	-	4-92

TABLE B-14
(continued)

ALAMEDA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
 TIME SPENT IN MAJOR PROCESSING STEPS
 PUBLIC ASSISTANCE CASES

Number of days	Number of cases				
	First contact to AFDC approval	AFDC approval to food stamp approval	Food stamp approval to ATP issue	Total processing time	Food stamp portion of total time
COMPLETED CASES--Initiated in August 1975					
0 (Same day)	1	72	4	1	2
1-7	1	9	54	1	51
8-14	10	2	24	4	25
15-21	18	2	4	7	4
22-28	30	1	-	22	3
29-35	11	1	1	20	1
36-42	9	-	-	17	1
43-49	3	-	-	7	-
50-56	2	-	-	4	-
57-63	2	-	-	1	-
64-70	-	-	-	2	-
92-98	-	-	-	1	-
Total	<u>87</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>87</u>	<u>87</u>
Average (days)	25.7	1.7	5.9	33.2	7.5
Range (days)	0-59	0-35	0-34	0-93	0-36

TABLE B-14a
(continued)

TABLE B-14a
(continued)

Number of days	Number of cases				Food stamp portion of total time
	First contact to AFDC approval	AFDC approval to food stamp approval	Food stamp approval to ATP issue	Total processing time	
PENDING CASES--As of date of review					
0 (Same day)	-	-	-	-	25
1-7	1	-	-	1	-
8-14	5	-	-	5	-
15-21	5	-	-	5	-
22-28	8	-	-	8	-
29-35	3	-	-	3	-
36-42	-	-	-	-	-
43-49	2	-	-	2	-
113-119	<u>1</u>	-	-	<u>1</u>	-
Total	<u>25</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>25</u>
Average (days)	25.8	-	-	25.8	0
Range (days)	6-117	-	-	6-117	0

MONTEREY COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
TIME SPENT IN MAJOR PROCESSING STEPS

Number of days	Number of cases					Total processing time
	First contact to application submission	Application submission to interview	Interview to completion of verification	Completion of verification to approval (denial)	Approval to issuance of ATP	
COMPLETED CASES--Initiated in August 1975						
0 (Same day)	43	48	48	50	13	10
1-7	<u>7</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>40</u>
Total	<u><u>50</u></u>	<u><u>50</u></u>	<u><u>50</u></u>	<u><u>50</u></u>	<u><u>49</u></u>	<u><u>50</u></u>
Average (days)	.3	0	0	0	1.3	1.7
Range (days)	0-5	0-1	0-1	0	0-5	0-6
PENDING CASES--As of date of review						
0 (Same day)	22	22	8	-	-	8
1-7	-	-	10	-	-	10
8-14	-	-	<u>4</u>	-	-	<u>4</u>
Total	<u><u>22</u></u>	<u><u>22</u></u>	<u><u>22</u></u>	<u><u>-</u></u>	<u><u>-</u></u>	<u><u>22</u></u>
Average (days)	0	0	3.8	-	-	3.8
Range (days)	0	0	0-14	-	-	0-14

EL DORADO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
 TIME SPENT IN MAJOR PROCESSING STEPS

Number of days	Number of cases					
	First contact to application submission	Application submission to interview	Interview to completion of verification	Completion of verification to approval (denial)	Approval to issuance of ATP	Total processing time
COMPLETED CASES--Initiated in August 1975						
0(Same day)	23	31	27	47	13	7
1-7	21	14	12	3	30	9
8-14	3	5	6	-	3	18
15-21	2	-	1	-	-	7
22-28	1	-	4	-	-	6
36-42	-	-	-	-	-	2
50-56	-	-	-	-	-	1
Total	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>50</u>
Average (days)	3.2	1.6	4.1	0.2	3.6	12.4
Range (days)	0-28	0-14	0-28	0-5	0-11	0-52
PENDING CASES--As of date of review						
0(Same day)	2	4	-	-	-	-
1-7	2	1	2	-	-	1
8-14	1	-	2	-	-	3
15-21	-	-	-	-	-	1
Total	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>5</u>
Average (days)	4.0	0.2	9.0	-	-	11.4
Range (days)	0-13	0-1	1-14	-	-	1-18

COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

MAJOR CAUSES OF DELAYS IN PROCESSING APPLICATIONS

Major causes of delays (note a)	Completed cases		Pending cases	
	Number of cases (note b)	Average number of days delay	Number of cases (note b)	Average number of days delay
Interview workload	46	12.1	28	11.1
Clerical workload	79	19.5	8	21.7
Reviewer workload	2	8.5	0	
Applicant failure or delay in furnishing supporting documentation	29	66.6	14	20.7
Centralized State is- suanace of authorization- to-purchase	13	43.8	7	10.5
Unidentified causes (note c)	10	17.9	32	23.5

a/The major causes of delays and the average number of days in those cases which took more than seven days were based on the general causes of delay in the most time consuming processing step(s).

b/The number of cases exceeds the 260 cases on table A-1 because some cases had multiple major delays of identical length.

c/Includes delays for which agency records did not indicate a particular cause.

BOONE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

MAJOR CAUSES OF DELAYS IN PROCESSING APPLICATIONS

Major causes of delays (note a)	Completed cases		Pending cases	
	Number of cases	Average number of days delay	Number of cases	Average number of days delay
Interview work- load	6	11.5	1	8.0
Unidentified causes (note b)	1	9.0	2	16.0

a/The major causes of delays and the average number of days in the 10 cases which took more than seven days were based on the general causes of delay in the most time consuming processing step.

b/Includes delays for which agency records did not indicate a particular cause.

MARION COUNTY, INDIANA

MAJOR CAUSES OF DELAYS IN PROCESSING APPLICATIONS

Major causes of delays (note a)	Completed cases		Pending cases	
	Number of cases (note b)	Average number of days delay	Number of cases (note b)	Average number of days delay
Applicant fail- ure or delay in furnishing supporting documentation	53	15.7	75	23.2
Supervisor de- lays in cer- tification due to work- load and inex- perienced staff	47	6.7		
Cutoff for issuance of authorization to purchase	22	7.8		
Clerical process- ing workload and procedures	48	6.6		

a/The major causes of delays and the average number of days in the 230 cases which took more than seven days were based on the general causes of delay in the most time consuming processing step(s).

b/The number of cases exceeds the 230 cases on table A-3 because some cases had multiple major delays of identical length.

PORTER COUNTY, INDIANA

MAJOR CAUSES OF DELAYS IN PROCESSING APPLICATIONS

Major causes of delays (note a)	Completed cases		Pending cases	
	Number of cases (note b)	Average number of days delay	Number of cases (note b)	Average number of days delay
Interview work- load (note c)	17	7.0	2	7.0
Applicant fail- ure or delay in furnishing supporting documenta- tion	10	20.9	14	18.3
Centralized is- surance of authorization to purchase	15	8.5		

a/The major causes of delays and the average number of days in the 43 cases which took more than seven days were based on the general causes of delay in the most time consuming processing step(s).

b/The number of cases exceeds the 43 cases on table A-4 because some cases had multiple major delays of identical length.

c/Based on estimates by Porter County officials and our review, an estimated seven days from first contact to application submission is included in processing time.

DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

MAJOR CAUSES OF DELAYS IN PROCESSING APPLICATIONS

Major causes of delays (note a)	Completed cases		Pending cases	
	Number of cases (note b)	Average number of days delay	Number of cases (note c)	Average number of days delay
Awaiting opening for interview	86	11.1	45	17.5
Applicant failure or delay in furnishing supporting documentation	45	18.4	15	15.2
Client delay in returning application	16	16.1	13	26.0
Client rescheduled appointment	11	14.2	3	23.7
Computer delay or error	9	9.1		
Caseworker delay	3	14.7		
Client missed appointment			1	57.0
Unidentified causes (note d)	62		22	

a/The delays analyzed occurred in the 228 completed and 95 pending cases taking over 7 days to process.

b/The number of cases exceeds the 228 cases from table A-5 because some completed cases had multiple major delays of identical length.

c/The number of cases exceeds the 95 cases from table A-5 because some pending cases had multiple major delays of identical length.

d/This category includes delays for which agency records did not indicate a particular cause.

WAYNE COUNTY, MICHIGAN

MAJOR CAUSES OF DELAYS IN PROCESSING APPLICATIONS

Major causes of delays (note a)	<u>Completed cases</u>		<u>Pending cases</u>	
	<u>Number of cases</u>	<u>Average number of days delay</u>	<u>Number of cases</u>	<u>Average number of days delay</u>
Applicant failure or delay in fur- nishing support- ing documentation	70	22	52	20
Delay in assigning food stamp case number	8	16	11	13
Caseworker did not manually issue ATP card	21	27	0	0
Delay in worker making home visit	0	0	3	30
Client requested computer issued ATP	4	20	0	0
Other administra- tive delay	3	27	2	43
Unidentified causes (note b)	5	49	0	0

a/For each of 111 completed and 68 pending cases taking over 7 days to process.

b/Includes cases where agency records did not indicate a specific cause of delay during a processing step.

MONROE COUNTY, MICHIGAN

MAJOR CAUSES OF DELAYS IN PROCESSING APPLICATIONS

Major causes of delays (note a)	<u>Completed cases</u>		<u>Pending cases</u>	
	<u>Number of cases</u>	<u>Average number of days delay</u>	<u>Number of cases</u>	<u>Average number of days delay</u>
Applicant failure or delay in fur- nishing support- ing documentation	3	16	8	24
Delay in sched- uling interviews	10	13	9	10
Administrative delays in proc- essing applica- tion	1	21	1	14

a/For each of 14 completed and 18 pending cases taking over 7 days to process.

CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO

MAJOR CAUSES OF DELAYS IN PROCESSING APPLICATIONS

Major causes of delays (note a)	Completed cases	
	Number of cases	Average number of days delay
Applicant failure or delay in furnishing supporting docu- mentation	1	5
Computer processing time	104	15
Client did not want manually issued ATP	1	14
Other administrative delay	3	15
Unidentified causes (note b)	2	23

a/For each of 111 completed cases taking over 7 days to process.

b/Includes cases where agency records did not indicate a specific cause of delay during a processing step.

MEDINA COUNTY, OHIO

MAJOR CAUSES OF DELAYS IN PROCESSING APPLICATIONS

Major causes of delays (note a)	<u>Completed causes</u>		<u>Pending cases</u>	
	<u>Number of cases</u>	<u>Average number of days delay</u>	<u>Number of cases</u>	<u>Average number of days delay</u>
Applicant failure or de- lay in furnish- ing supporting documentation	2	30	9	17
Administrative delay in typing manual ATP cards	3	12		
Administrative de- lay in mailing denial letter	1	11		

a/For each of six completed cases and nine pending cases taking over 7 days to process.

BALTIMORE CITY, MARYLAND

MAJOR CAUSES OF DELAYS IN PROCESSING APPLICATIONS

Major causes of delays (note a)	Completed cases		Pending cases	
	Number of cases (note b)	Average number of days delay	Number of cases	Average number of days delay
Delay in holding an interview	14	17.9	-	-
Applicant's failure or delay in furnishing supporting documentation	130	22.7	49	33.2
Verification difficulties with master file clearance	33	19.5	6	21.3
Caseworker delay in approving qualified applications	6	26.3	-	-
Data processing of ATP cards	64	12.8	-	-

a/For 237 completed and 55 pending cases taking over 7 days to process.

b/The number of completed cases exceeds the 237 cases on table A-10 because some cases had multiple major delays of identical length.

HARFORD COUNTY, MARYLAND

MAJOR CAUSES OF DELAYS IN PROCESSING APPLICATIONS

Major causes of delays (note a)	Completed cases		Pending cases	
	Number of cases (note b)	Average number of days delay	Number of cases	Average number of days delay
Delay in holding an interview	26	15.1	-	-
Applicant's failure or delay in fur- nishing supporting documentation	17	14.9	16	28.0
Processing of ATP cards	1	11.0	-	-

a/For 43 completed and 16 pending cases taking over 7 days to process.

b/The number of completed cases exceeds the 43 cases on table A-11 because one case had multiple delays of identical length.

CECIL COUNTY, MARYLAND

MAJOR CAUSES OF DELAYS IN PROCESSING APPLICATIONS

Major causes of delays (note a)	Completed cases		Pending cases	
	Number of cases (note b)	Average number of days delay	Number of cases	Average number of days delay
Delay in holding an interview	3	8.3	-	-
Applicant's fail- ure or delay in furnishing sup- porting docu- mentation	14	12.2	7	17.6
Food stamp is- suanance	5	6.0	-	-

a/For 19 completed and 7 pending cases taking over 7 days to process.

b/The number of completed cases exceeds the 19 cases on table A-12 because some cases had multiple delays of identical length.

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

MAJOR CAUSES OF DELAYS IN PROCESSING APPLICATIONS

Major causes of delays (note a)	Completed cases		Pending cases	
	Number of cases (note b)	Average number of days delay	Number of cases	Average number of days delay
Scheduling interviews	15	5.5	7	5.7
Rescheduling interviews for applicant's convenience	8	10.8	11	12.5
Applicant failure or delay in furnishing supporting documenta- tion	14	9.6	27	9.5
Awaiting determination of eligibility as a PA case	-	-	2	6.5
Completion of home visit	-	-	1	8.0
Awaiting assignment of case number or ob- taining old case file if applicant was a former food stamp recipient	27	6.8	-	-
Obtaining document to input action taken and generate ATP	-	-	8	7.5
Lost or improperly prepared documents to generate ATP	9	21.4	-	-
Month end cutoff for printing of ATP's	57	9.9	-	-

a/For 122 completed and 56 pending cases taking over 7 days to process.

b/The number of completed cases exceeds the 122 cases on table A-13 because some cases had multiple major delays of identical or nearly identical length.

MAJOR CAUSES OF DELAYS IN PROCESSING APPLICATIONS

Major causes of delays (note b)	Nonassistance				Public assistance (note a)	
	Completed cases		Pending cases		Completed cases	
	Number of cases	Average number of days delay	Number of cases	Average number of days delay	Number of cases	Average number of days delay
Scheduling interviews	15	8.1	14	7.0	(c)	-
Rescheduling interviews for applicant's convenience	23	19.6	12	14.6	(c)	-
Applicant did not appear at scheduled interview	4	30.3	-	-	(c)	-
Delays in obtaining case file from storage	-	-	4	22.5	1	34.0
Applicant failure or delay in furnishing supporting documentation	124	19.8	59	26.8	(c)	-
Eligibility worker workload affecting processing of a verified application	-	-	6	14.0	-	-
Food stamp approval pending	-	-	-	-	5	20.3
Supervisory review	5	12.2	3	7.0	1	5.0
Fiscal or data processing center delay	23	9.3	-	-	15	11.4
Suspension of ATP printing near end of month	29	11.2	-	-	15	9.7
Other	1	29.0	-	-	-	-

a/Pending cases are not shown since all the cases were still awaiting aid to families with dependent children approval at the time of our review (see tables B-14a and b).

b/For 153 completed and 72 pending nonassistance cases taking over 7 days to process. For the public assistance cases, applies only to the 34 completed cases which required more than 7 days to process the food stamp portion of the application. The total number of cases included in this table exceeds the number of cases in the table A-14 series because some cases had multiple major delays of identical or nearly identical length.

c/These delays were not included for public assistance cases since they related to processing steps occurring during the aid to families with dependent children portion of the application.

MONTEREY COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

MAJOR CAUSES OF DELAYS IN PROCESSING APPLICATIONS

Major cause of delays (note b)	Completed cases (note a)		Pending cases	
	Number of cases	Average number of days delay	Number of cases	Average number of days delay
Applicant failure or delay in fur- nishing support- ing documentation	-	-	4	10.8

a/All completed cases processed in 7 days or less (see tables A-15 and B-15).

b/For four pending cases taking over 7 days to process.

EL DORADO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

MAJOR CAUSES OF DELAYS IN PROCESSING APPLICATIONS

Major causes of delays (note a)	Completed cases		Pending cases	
	Number of cases (note b)	Average number of days delay	Number of cases	Average number of days delay
Scheduling inter- views	4	16.5	-	-
Rescheduling inter- views for appli- cant's convenience	7	19.7	1	14.0
Applicant failure on delay in fur- nishing support- ing document- tion	16	19.4	3	14.0
Fiscal department review and recording of applications; preparing input document to generate ATP	7	9.4	-	-
Month end cutoff for printing of ATP's	3	14.0	-	-

a/For 34 completed and 4 pending cases taking over 7 days to process.

b/The number of completed cases exceeds the 34 cases on table A-16 because some cases had multiple major delays of identical or nearly identical length.

COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

TOTAL WORKLOAD FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER 1975

<u>Month</u>	<u>New cases received (note a)</u>	<u>Approved (note b)</u>	<u>Denied or withdrawn (note b)</u>	<u>Pending and carried over</u>
(January 1)				(c)
January	(c)	(c)	(c)	(c)
February	993	490	115	639
March	2,522	1,473	431	942
April	1,901	1,204	329	899
May	1,847	1,213	524	882
June	2,631	1,523	461	1,148
July	3,112	1,545	597	1,566
August	2,387	1,483	667	1,227
September	2,989	1,300	628	1,987
October	2,740	1,474	845	1,542

a/Includes new cases and reapplications only; data on recertifications not available.

b/County statistics did not include the disposition of some cases carried over from the prior month and therefore the numbers of cases approved and denied are understated.

c/Not available.

BOONE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

TOTAL WORKLOAD FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER 1975

<u>Month</u>	<u>New cases received (note a)</u>	<u>Approved (note b)</u>	<u>Denied or withdrawn (note b)</u>	<u>Pending and carried over</u>
(January 1)				(c)
January	(c)	197	(c)	0
February	(c)	163	(c)	0
March	228	213	15	0
April	246	223	23	0
May	143	114	29	0
June	140	120	18	2
July	148	128	20	0
August	203	179	23	1
September	139	128	8	3
October	165	143	21	1

a/Includes new cases and reapplications only; data on recertifications not available.

b/County statistics did not include the disposition of cases carried over from the prior month and therefore the numbers of cases approved and denied are understated.

c/Not available.

MARION COUNTY, INDIANA

TOTAL WORKLOAD FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER 1975

<u>Month</u>	<u>New cases received (note a)</u>	<u>Approved (note b)</u>	<u>Denied (note b)</u>	<u>Withdrawn (note a)</u>	<u>Pending and carried over (note a)</u>
(January 1)					-
January	-	4,392	1,401	-	-
February	-	3,655	1,365	-	-
March	-	4,644	1,308	-	-
April	-	5,411	1,442	-	-
May	-	4,786	1,185	-	-
June	-	5,617	1,474	-	-
July	-	5,161	1,857	-	-
August	-	4,289	1,600	-	-
September	-	4,911	1,975	-	-
October	-	5,180	1,949	-	-

a/Marion County did not maintain data on new cases received, withdrawn, or carried over at the end of the month.

b/Includes new certifications, recertifications, and reapplications.

PORTER COUNTY, INDIANA

TOTAL WORKLOAD FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER 1975

<u>Month</u>	<u>New cases received</u> (note a)	<u>Approved</u> (note b)	<u>Denied</u> (note b)	<u>With- drawn</u> (note a)	<u>Pending and carried over</u> (note a)
(January 1)					-
January	-	277	35	-	-
February	-	247	27	-	-
March	-	339	50	-	-
April	-	304	60	-	-
May	-	243	58	-	-
June	-	242	47	-	-
July	-	292	65	-	-
August	-	259	52	-	-
September	-	268	42	-	-
October	-	301	53	-	-

a/Porter County did not maintain data on new cases received, withdrawn, or carried over at the end of the month.

b/Includes new certifications, recertifications, and re-applications.

DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

TOTAL WORKLOAD FROM JANUARY TO SEPTEMBER 1975

<u>Month</u>	<u>New cases received (note a)</u>	<u>Approved</u>	<u>Denied</u>	<u>Pending and carried over</u>
(January 1)				1,191
January	7,509	5,756	1,874	1,070
February	7,285	5,286	1,844	1,225
March	10,225	7,393	2,910	1,147
April	9,320	6,439	2,805	1,223
May	7,823	5,522	2,504	1,020
June	7,776	5,411	2,198	1,187
July	8,290	5,866	2,512	1,099
August	6,633	4,550	2,290	892
September	8,373	5,278	2,909	1,078

a/Includes new applications, reapplications, and recertifications.

WAYNE COUNTY, MICHIGAN

TOTAL WORKLOAD FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER 1975 (note a)

<u>Month</u>	<u>Cases received</u>	<u>Approved</u>	<u>Denied</u>	<u>With-drawn</u>	<u>Pending and carried over</u>
(January 1)					939
January	2,521	1,591	668	129	1,072
February	3,442	2,206	1,108	66	1,134
March	3,382	2,339	964	127	1,086
April	4,465	2,756	1,148	78	1,569
May	3,732	2,638	1,140	175	1,348
June	4,207	2,731	1,246	63	1,515
July	4,004	2,628	1,369	158	1,364
August	5,052	2,974	1,552	175	1,715
September	5,467	3,687	1,702	74	1,719
October	4,790	3,092	1,591	54	1,772

a/Includes new cases, reapplications, and recertifications.

MONROE COUNTY, MICHIGAN

TOTAL WORKLOAD FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER 1975 (note a)

<u>Month</u>	<u>Cases received</u>	<u>Approved</u>	<u>Denied</u>	<u>With-drawn</u>	<u>Pending and carried over</u>
(January 1)					258
January	494	195	55	83	419
February	317	170	51	100	415
March	234	140	152	215	142
April	246	137	42	84	125
May	255	123	46	54	157
June	346	204	42	103	154
July	534	401	75	72	140
August	527	318	64	80	205
September	484	369	41	162	117
October	411	278	66	80	104

a/Includes new cases and reapplications for all months.
Recertifications are included starting with July.

CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO

TOTAL WORKLOAD FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER 1975 (note a)

<u>Month</u>	<u>Cases received</u>	<u>Approved</u>	<u>Denied</u>	<u>With- drawn</u>	<u>Pending and carried over</u>
(January 1)					0
January	8,486	7,674	812	0	0
February	8,507	7,550	957	0	0
March	10,190	8,843	1,347	0	0
April	8,833	7,683	1,150	0	0
May	9,288	8,108	1,180	0	0
June	8,510	7,456	1,054	0	0
July	9,159	7,667	1,492	0	0
August	8,866	7,457	1,409	0	0
September	8,508	7,005	1,503	0	0
October	9,503	7,891	1,612	0	0

a/Includes new cases, reapplications, and recertifications.

MEDINA COUNTY, OHIO

TOTAL WORKLOAD FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER 1975 (note a)

<u>Month</u>	<u>Cases received</u>	<u>Approved</u>	<u>Denied</u>	<u>With- drawn</u>	<u>Pending and carried over</u>
(January 1)					16
January	347	322	39	0	2
February	557	476	71	0	12
March	575	494	70	0	23
April	608	537	74	0	20
May	509	460	47	0	22
June	448	416	31	0	23
July	556	514	42	0	23
August	472	402	68	0	25
September	584	521	63	0	25
October	408	354	53	0	26

a/Includes new cases, reapplications, and recertifications.

BALTIMORE CITY, MARYLAND

TOTAL WORKLOAD FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER 1975 (note a)

<u>Month</u>	<u>New cases received (note b)</u>	<u>Approved</u>	<u>Denied</u>	<u>With-drawn</u>	<u>Pending and carried over</u>
(January 1)					440
January (note c)	928	688	183	-	574
February	1,122	921	250	-	523
March	1,482	1,084	295	-	613
April (note c)	1,565	985	295	-	787
May	1,473	1,137	382	-	705
June	1,500	1,241	365	-	799
July	1,601	1,228	462	-	737
August	1,478	1,118	361	-	731
September	1,443	1,148	394	-	613
October	1,517	1,093	409	-	593

a/Includes only non-public assistance cases in the five districts reviewed; public assistance food stamp caseload statistics were not readily available. The statistics were obtained from agency reports and contained minor errors. We were unable to obtain correct statistics from agency records.

b/Includes new cases, reapplications, and recertifications.

c/Statistics were not available in one district.

HARFORD COUNTY, MARYLAND

TOTAL WORKLOAD FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER 1975

This table could not be completed because we found that the information provided by Harford County officials was inaccurate and did not reflect the actual workload.

CECIL COUNTY, MARYLAND

TOTAL WORKLOAD FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER 1975 (note a)

<u>Month</u>	New cases received (<u>note b</u>)	<u>Approved</u>	<u>Denied</u>	<u>With- drawn</u>	<u>Pending and carried over</u>
(January 1)					453
January	379	305	141	148	238
February	462	251	181	71	197
March	392	126	176	79	208
April	653	432	166	155	108
May	641	398	116	112	123
June	537	356	100	93	111
July	616	395	174	93	65
August	524	322	139	74	54
September	616	357	89	80	144
October	648	390	254	69	79

a/Includes only non-public assistance cases; public assistance food stamp caseload statistics were not readily available.

b/Includes new cases, reapplications, and recertifications.

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
TOTAL WORKLOAD FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER 1975

<u>Month</u>	<u>New applications</u>					<u>Recertifi- cations completed (note a)</u>
	<u>Received</u>	<u>Approved</u>	<u>Denied</u>	<u>With- drawn or other</u>	<u>Pending</u>	
(January 1)					51	
January	2,711	2,508	180	-	74	5,412
February	(b)	2,373	(b)	(b)	68	6,526
March	(b)	5,515	391	-	79	8,478
April	(b)	4,064	518	-	51	7,994
May	(b)	3,453	630	-	42	7,733
June	3,525	3,257	285	-	25	7,816
July	4,028	3,707	313	-	33	7,705
August	3,621	3,321	291	-	42	7,364
September	4,703	4,400	310	-	35	7,505
October	(b)	(b)	(b)	(b)	(b)	(b)

a/The breakdown of approved and denied cases not available.

b/Data not available.

ALAMEDA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

TOTAL NONASSISTANCE WORKLOAD FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER 1975

Month	New applications				Pending (note a)	Recertifi- cations completed (note b)
	Received	Approved	Denied	With- drawn or other		
(January 1)					2,688	
January	3,195	1,270	576	17	4,018	2,910
February	(c)	1,424	(c)	(c)	(c)	3,333
March	(c)	1,738	(c)	(c)	(c)	3,571
April	(c)	1,480	(c)	(c)	(c)	3,869
May	(c)	1,738	(c)	(c)	103	3,571
June	2,485	1,104	965	54	465	3,621
July	2,828	1,503	779	39	905	2,118
August	2,208	1,266	767	36	1,167	3,130
September	2,479	1,492	758	46	1,313	2,067
October	2,873	1,893	860	92	1,346	1,894

a/The statistics were obtained from agency reports and contained minor errors which we were unable to correct.

b/The breakdown of approved and denied cases not available.

c/Data not available.

MONTEREY COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

TOTAL WORKLOAD FROM JANUARY TO OCTOBER 1975

<u>Month</u>	<u>New applications</u>					<u>Recertifi- cations completed (note a)</u>
	<u>Received</u>	<u>Approved</u>	<u>Denied</u>	<u>With- drawn or other</u>	<u>Pending</u>	
(January 1)					-	
January	770	693	77	-	-	4,118
February	663	574	89	-	-	3,448
March	570	503	67	-	-	3,183
April	774	641	133	-	-	3,141
May	729	628	101	-	-	2,574
June	567	461	106	-	-	2,659
July	611	522	89	-	-	2,672
August	581	390	191	-	-	2,662
September (note b)						
October (note b)						

a/The breakdown of approved and denied cases not available.

b/Data not available.

EL DORADO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
TOTAL WORKLOAD FROM
JANUARY TO OCTOBER 1975 (note a)

<u>Month</u>	<u>New cases received</u>	<u>Approved</u>	<u>Denied</u>	<u>With- drawn or other</u>	<u>Pending and carried over</u>
(January 1)					47
January	425	212	36	2	222
February	431	168	237	1	247
March	460	203	304	-	200
April	506	206	313	-	187
May	539	212	338	-	176
June	641	290	40	1	486
July	454	406	191	-	343
August	392	367	144	-	224
September	505	330	205	4	190
October (note b)					

a/Includes new cases, reapplications, and recertifications.

b/Data not available.

COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

CHANGES IN BONUS DOLLARS RESULTING FROM VERIFYING

INFORMATION FURNISHED BY APPLICANTS

<u>Primary item involved</u>	<u>Number of cases</u>	<u>Change in monthly bonus dollars</u>		
		<u>Average</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Total</u>
BENEFITS TO THE GOVERNMENT				
Earned income	7	\$77	\$24-128	\$539
Annuities, pensions, etc.	4	54	12-107	214
Assistance income	1	37	37	37
Medical expenses	3	46	9-116	137
Child care expenses	4	52	24--88	208
Unusual expenses	1	23	23	23
Shelter expenses	<u>21</u>	20	2-102	<u>427</u>
Subtotal	<u>41</u>	\$39	\$ 2-128	<u>\$1,585</u>
BENEFITS TO THE RECIPIENTS				
Earned income	2	\$26	\$ 7--45	\$ 52
Assistance income	1	30	30	30
Medical expenses	2	12	6--18	24
Child care expenses	<u>1</u>	24	24	<u>24</u>
Subtotal	<u>6</u>	\$22	\$ 6--45	<u>\$130</u>
BENEFITS UNCHANGED	<u>128</u>			
RESULTS NOT DETERMINABLE	<u>75</u>			
Total	<u>250</u>			

BOONE COUNTY, ILLINOIS

CHANGES IN BONUS DOLLARS RESULTING FROM VERIFYING
INFORMATION FURNISHED BY APPLICANTS

<u>Primary item involved</u>	<u>Number of cases</u>	<u>Change in monthly bonus dollars</u>		
		<u>Average</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Total</u>
BENEFITS TO THE GOVERNMENT				
Earned income	1	\$35	\$ 35	\$ 35
Annuities, pension, etc.	1	36	36	36
Other income	1	6	6	6
Mandatory deductions	1	18	18	18
Medical expenses	1	10	10	10
Child support payments	1	4	4	4
Shelter expenses	<u>5</u>	34	25-40	<u>168</u>
Subtotal	<u>11</u>	\$25	\$ 4-40	<u>\$277</u>
BENEFITS TO THE RECIPIENTS				
Earned income	1	\$43	\$ 43	\$ 43
Annuities, pension, etc.	1	9	9	9
Mandatory deductions	1	3	3	3
Shelter expenses	<u>3</u>	17	3-30	<u>52</u>
Subtotal	<u>6</u>	\$18	\$3-43	<u>\$107</u>
BENEFITS UNCHANGED	<u>22</u>			
RESULTS NOT DETERMINABLE	<u>11</u>			
Total	<u>50</u>			

MARION COUNTY, INDIANA

CHANGES IN BONUS DOLLARS RESULTING FROM VERIFYING
INFORMATION FURNISHED BY APPLICANTS

<u>Primary item involved</u>	<u>Number of cases</u>	<u>Change in monthly bonus dollars</u>		
		<u>Average</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Total</u>
BENEFITS TO THE GOVERNMENT				
Medical expenses	<u>1</u>	\$18	\$18	<u>\$18</u>
BENEFITS TO THE RECIPIENTS				
Unemployment compensation	<u>1</u>	\$90	\$90	<u>\$90</u>
BENEFITS UNCHANGED	<u>53</u>			
RESULTS NOT DETERMINABLE	<u>195</u>			
Total	<u>250</u>			

PORTER COUNTY, INDIANA
 CHANGES IN BONUS DOLLARS RESULTING FROM VERIFYING
 INFORMATION FURNISHED BY APPLICANTS

<u>Primary item involved</u>	<u>Number of cases</u>	<u>Change in monthly bonus dollars</u>		
		<u>Average</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Total</u>
BENEFITS TO THE GOVERNMENT				
Earned income	2	\$36	\$22 to 49	\$ 71
Other income	2	66	4 to 128	132
Medical expenses	<u>1</u>	6	6	<u>6</u>
Subtotal	<u>5</u>	\$42	\$4 to 128	<u>\$209</u>
BENEFITS TO THE RECIPIENT				
Child-care expense	<u>1</u>	\$13	\$13	\$ <u>13</u>
BENEFITS UNCHANGED				
	<u>2</u>			
RESULTS NOT DETERMINABLE				
	<u>42</u>			
Total	<u>50</u>			

DALLAS COUNTY, TEXAS

CHANGES IN BONUS DOLLARS RESULTING FROM VERIFYING
INFORMATION FURNISHED BY APPLICANTS

Primary item involved (note a)	Number of cases	Change in monthly bonus dollars		
		Average	Range	Total
BENEFITS TO THE GOVERNMENT	<u>112</u>	\$58.81	\$2-300	<u>\$6,699</u>
BENEFITS TO THE RECIPIENTS	<u>45</u>	\$32.16	\$2-249	<u>\$1,447</u>
BENEFITS UN- CHANGED	<u>66</u>			
RESULTS NOT DETERMINABLE	<u>27</u>			
Total	<u>250</u>			

a/We were unable to categorize the payoff by the primary item causing the difference.

WAYNE COUNTY, MICHIGAN
CHANGES IN BONUS DOLLARS RESULTING FROM
VERIFYING INFORMATION FURNISHED BY APPLICANTS

We could not determine changes resulting
from verification in any of the 250
Wayne County cases reviewed.

MONROE COUNTY, MICHIGAN
CHANGES IN BONUS DOLLARS RESULTING FROM
VERIFYING INFORMATION FURNISHED BY APPLICANTS

We could not determine changes resulting from verification in any of the 50 Monroe County cases reviewed.

MEDINA COUNTY, OHIO

CHANGES IN BONUS DOLLARS RESULTING FROM VERIFYING
INFORMATION FURNISHED BY APPLICANTS

Primary item involved (note a)	Number of cases	Change in monthly bonus dollars		
		<u>Average</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Total</u>
BENEFITS TO THE GOVERN- MENT	12	\$56	\$2 to \$158	<u>\$671</u>
BENEFITS TO THE RECIPIENTS	3	\$85	\$6 to \$222	<u>\$256</u>
BENEFITS UNCHANGED	35			
RESULTS NOT DETERMINABLE	<u>0</u>			
Total	<u>50</u>			

a/We were unable to identify the primary items causing the changes.

CUYAHOGA COUNTY, OHIO

CHANGES IN BONUS DOLLARS RESULTING FROM
VERIFYING INFORMATION FURNISHED BY APPLICANTS

Primary item <u>involved</u>	Number of <u>cases</u>	<u>Change in monthly bonus dollars</u>			
		<u>Average</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Total</u>	
BENEFITS TO THE GOVERNMENT					
Assets	1	\$ 40	\$ 40	\$ 40	\$ 40
Earned income	23	62	3 to	128	1,421
Pension income	7	54	12 to	162	380
Other income	11	66	6 to	197	726
Medical expense	9	23	6 to	67	204
Shelter expense	23	53	2 to	278	1,217
Household size	5	71	27 to	132	354
Program referral	3	105	48 to	178	316
Tuition expense	1	27	27		27
Living quarters	<u>3</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>48 to</u>	<u>128</u>	<u>266</u>
Subtotal	<u>86</u>	\$ 58	\$ 2 to	\$278	<u>\$4,951</u>
BENEFITS TO THE RECIPIENT					
Assets	1	\$ 48	\$ 48	\$ 48	\$ 48
Earned income	10	52	9 to	134	519
Other income	5	75	6 to	158	377
Medical expense	3	38	3 to	94	115
Shelter expense	14	30	2 to	82	414
Household size	1	20	20		20
Support expense	3	16	12 to	22	49
Tuition expense	1	28	28		28
Household head	<u>1</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>		<u>6</u>
Subtotal	<u>39</u>	\$ 40	\$ 2 to	\$158	<u>\$1,576</u>
BENEFITS UNCHANGED	<u>125</u>				
RESULTS NOT DETERMINABLE	<u>0</u>				
Total	<u>250</u>				

BALTIMORE CITY, MARYLAND

CHANGES IN BONUS DOLLARS RESULTING FROM VERIFYING
INFORMATION FURNISHED BY APPLICANTS

<u>Primary item involved</u>	<u>Number of cases</u>	<u>Change in monthly bonus dollars</u>		
		<u>Average</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Total</u>
BENEFITS TO THE GOVERNMENT				
Income	10	\$59	\$3 - 162	\$585
Medical expense	2	14	9 - 18	27
Shelter expense	<u>4</u>	17	3 - 34	<u>67</u>
Subtotal	<u>16</u>	\$42	\$3 - 162	<u>\$679</u>
BENEFITS TO THE RECIPIENTS				
Income	1	\$44	\$ 44	\$ 44
Shelter expense	5	10	6 - 18	48
Medical expense	2	63	7 - 118	125
Mandatory deductions	<u>1</u>	18	18	<u>18</u>
Subtotal	<u>9</u>	\$26	\$6 - 118	<u>\$235</u>
BENEFITS UNCHANGED	<u>74</u>			
RESULTS NOT DETERMINABLE	<u>152</u>			
TOTAL	<u>251</u>			

HARFORD COUNTY, MARYLAND

CHANGES IN BONUS DOLLARS RESULTING FROM VERIFYING

INFORMATION FURNISHED BY APPLICANTS

<u>Primary item involved</u>	<u>Number of cases</u>	<u>Change in monthly bonus dollars</u>		
		<u>Average</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Total</u>
BENEFITS TO THE GOVERNMENT				
Income	3	\$21	\$4 - 48	\$ 63
Medical expense	1	78	78	78
Household size	<u>1</u>	4	4	<u>4</u>
Subtotal	<u>5</u>	\$29	\$4 - 78	<u>\$145</u>
BENEFITS TO THE RECIPIENTS				
Shelter expense	<u>1</u>	\$12	\$ 12	<u>\$12</u>
BENEFITS UNCHANGED	<u>27</u>			
RESULTS NOT DETERMINABLE	<u>22</u>			
Total	<u>55</u>			

CECIL COUNTY, MARYLAND
CHANGES IN BONUS DOLLARS RESULTING FROM VERIFYING
INFORMATION FURNISHED BY APPLICANTS

We could not determine changes resulting from verification in any of the 50 Cecil County cases reviewed.

SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
 CHANGES IN BONUS DOLLARS RESULTING FROM VERIFYING
 INFORMATION FURNISHED BY APPLICANTS

Primary item <u>involved</u>	Number of <u>cases</u>	<u>Change in monthly bonus dollars</u>		
		<u>Average</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Total</u>
BENEFITS TO THE GOVERNMENT				
Income	21	\$26	\$ 1-169	\$ 549
Expense	8	8	4- 21	64
Household size	2	98	22-174	196
Failure to verify	1	47	47	47
No visible means of support	1	48	48	48
Ineligibility	<u>6</u>	49	12- 90	<u>294</u>
Subtotal	<u>39</u>	\$31	\$ 1-174	<u>\$1,198</u>
BENEFITS TO THE RECIPIENTS				
Income	18	\$29	\$ 1- 78	\$ 522
Expense	11	11	2- 26	120
Household size	<u>1</u>	38	38	<u>38</u>
Subtotal	<u>30</u>	\$23	\$ 1- 78	<u>\$ 680</u>
BENEFITS UNCHANGED	<u>152</u>			
RESULTS NOT DETERMINABLE	<u>29</u>			
Total	<u>250</u>			

ALAMEDA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
 CHANGES IN BONUS DOLLARS RESULTING FROM VERIFYING INFORMATION
 FURNISHED BY NONASSISTANCE APPLICANTS

Primary item involved	Number of cases	Change in monthly bonus dollars		
		Average	Range	Total
BENEFITS TO THE GOVERNMENT				
Income	24	\$48	\$ 2-162	\$1,158
Expense	7	17	3- 32	117
Household	3	48	29- 68	145
Failure to verify	15	70	12-161	1,057
Ineligibility	1	48	48	48
Application withdrawn	<u>1</u>	15	15	<u>15</u>
Subtotal	<u>51</u>	\$50	\$ 2-162	<u>\$2,540</u>
BENEFITS TO THE RECIPIENTS				
Income	12	\$23	\$ 2- 49	\$ 271
Expense	<u>2</u>	8	6- 9	<u>15</u>
Subtotal	<u>14</u>	\$20	\$ 2- 49	<u>\$ 286</u>
BENEFITS UNCHANGED	<u>81</u>			
RESULTS NOT DETERMINABLE	<u>17</u>			
TOTAL	<u>163</u>			

MONTEREY COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
 CHANGES IN BONUS DOLLARS RESULTING FROM VERIFYING
 INFORMATION FURNISHED BY APPLICANTS

<u>Primary item involved</u>	<u>Number of cases</u>	<u>Change in monthly bonus dollars</u>		
		<u>Average</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Total</u>
BENEFITS TO THE GOVERNMENT				
Income	11	\$20	\$ 1-48	\$223
Expense	6	10	3-19	62
Household size	<u>2</u>	40	38-42	<u>80</u>
Subtotal	<u>19</u>	\$19	\$ 1-48	<u>\$365</u>
BENEFITS TO THE RECIPIENTS				
Income	1	\$18	\$ 18	\$ 18
Expense	<u>1</u>	28	28	<u>28</u>
Subtotal	<u>2</u>	\$23	\$18-28	\$ <u>46</u>
BENEFITS UNCHANGED	<u>29</u>			
RESULTS NOT DETERMINABLE	<u>0</u>			
Total	<u>50</u>			

EL DORADO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA
 CHANGES IN BONUS DOLLARS RESULTING FROM VERIFYING
 INFORMATION FURNISHED BY APPLICANTS

Primary item <u>involved</u>	Number of <u>cases</u>	Change in <u>monthly bonus dollars</u>		
		<u>Average</u>	<u>Range</u>	<u>Total</u>
BENEFITS TO THE GOVERNMENT				
Income	4	\$69	\$12-169	\$274
Expense	5	33	3- 97	165
Failure to verify	<u>3</u>	84	42-161	<u>251</u>
Subtotal	<u>12</u>	\$58	\$ 3-169	<u>\$690</u>
BENEFITS TO THE RECIPIENTS				
Income	3	\$39	\$ 2- 90	\$116
Expense	<u>2</u>	18	9- 27	<u>36</u>
Subtotal	<u>5</u>	\$30	\$ 2- 90	<u>\$152</u>
BENEFITS UNCHANGED	<u>32</u>			
RESULTS NOT DETERMINABLE	<u>1</u>			
Total	<u>50</u>			